

Also, a bill (H. R. 7716) granting an increase of pension to Elias Rippee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7717) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7718) granting a pension to James H. Rowden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Rowlett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7720) granting a pension to Elizabeth Saunders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7721) granting an increase of pension to G. S. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7722) granting a pension to Walter Skeen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7723) granting a pension to Henrietta C. Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7724) granting a pension to Sophie Stephan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7725) granting an increase of pension to Josephine D. Steffins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7726) granting a pension to Thomas Stockton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7727) granting an increase of pension to W. H. H. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7728) granting an increase of pension to Jerry W. Tallman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7729) granting a pension to Augustus Thompson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7730) granting a pension to Lauson Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7731) granting a pension to Fred Trilsch; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7732) granting a pension to Joseph Turnbough; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7733) granting an increase of pension to Eliza E. Tuttle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7734) for the relief of John Upton; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7735) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7736) granting an increase of pension to Mary Westerfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7737) granting a pension to Samuel Whitsett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7738) granting a pension to Abner Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7739) granting a pension to Nicholas J. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7740) for the relief of Erhard Woener; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7741) granting a pension to W. Woolsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 7742) granting a pension to James McGeehee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7743) granting a pension to Mary Mackey Applegate; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7744) granting a pension to William H. Strothkamp; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7745) granting an increase of pension to James Uzzle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 7746) granting an increase of pension to James M. Howes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: A bill (H. R. 7747) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Paup; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 7748) for the relief of A. E. Wagstaff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TAVENNER: A bill (H. R. 7749) granting a pension to Andrew J. Leonard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 7750) granting a pension to Clara E. Brass; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Thomas O'Reilly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Victoria Capan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DALE: Petition of the National Liquor League of the United States at Chicago, Ill., protesting against an appropriation to pay the expenses of delegates to the Anti-Saloon League convention at Milan, Italy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against a duty on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of the St. Louis Branch of the Railway Mail Association, favoring admission in time of peace of railway postal clerks in the service of the United States to the Army and Navy Hospital; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of the United Commercial Travelers of America at Carthage, Mo., favoring 1-cent letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of the National Liquor League of the United States at Chicago, Ill., and the Missouri State Liquor Dealers' Association, protesting against the payment of the expenses of Anti-Saloon League delegates to their convention at Milan, Italy; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against the duty on books in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against the proposed import tax on books printed in a language other than English; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEWIS of Pennsylvania: Papers to accompany bill granting a pension to Sarah A. Hamersly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MANN: Petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, protesting against a tax on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Harvey Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Jones Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REILLY of Connecticut: Petition of Housatonic Valley Pomona Grange, No. 10, South Kent, Conn., favoring the administration policy in regard to an enlarged parcel post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, New York, N. Y., protesting against the proposed import tax on books printed in a language other than English; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCULLY: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against a duty on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the German-American Alliance of Middlesex Branch, N. J., protesting against a duty on books published in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEPHENS of California: Petition of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, of Los Angeles, Cal., favoring a strong Navy for the United States; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIS: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against a duty on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of New York: Petition of the Association of German Authors of America, protesting against the proposed duty on books printed in foreign languages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of the North Dakota State Retail Jewelers' Association, favoring the passage of legislation respecting the sale of watches; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, August 23, 1913.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I present a resolution adopted by the Legislature of Texas relative to the marketing of farm products. I ask that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there are thousands of dollars lost to the farmers of Texas every year through inadequate marketing facilities and imperfect knowledge in regard to the same; and
Whereas every farmers' organization in Texas has declared in favor of State and Federal aid to better marketing conditions; and
Whereas this legislature in the present session has appropriated \$15,000 to be used in gathering and distributing information in regard to more efficient methods of marketing farm crops: Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the Legislature of Texas. That our Representatives and Senators in Congress be urged to give the subject of marketing farm products, and especially those of a perishable nature, their most earnest consideration to the end that some method may be devised to prevent the enormous waste that now annually takes place between the producer and consumer of farm products; and be it further

Resolved. That a copy of this resolution, properly indorsed, be sent by the chief clerk of the house to each of the Texas Representatives and Senators in Congress as well as to the Secretary of Agriculture.

I hereby certify that the above resolution was unanimously adopted.

W. R. LONG,

Chief Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented a memorial from sundry students in summer session at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Mich., remonstrating against the imposition of a duty on books of all kinds imported into the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. OLIVER presented petitions signed by sundry citizens of the State of Pennsylvania, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. LEA presented a petition signed by sundry citizens of the State of Tennessee, praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution granting the right of suffrage to women, which was ordered to lie on the table.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3023) relating to the duties of registers of United States land offices and the publication in newspapers of official land-office notices; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. JONES:

A bill (S. 3024) waiving the age limit for the appointment as assistant paymaster in the United States Navy in the case of Chief Commissary Steward Stamford Chapman, United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CRAWFORD:

A bill (S. 3025) granting a pension to Roland J. Patrick (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL.

Mr. JONES. I submit an amendment to the tariff bill relative to the provision for an inheritance tax. I ask that the amendment may lie on the table and be printed and that it also may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed and also to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. JONES to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, viz: Add a new section, as follows:

SEC. —. That a tax shall be, and is hereby, imposed upon the transfer of any property, real or personal, or of any interest therein or income therefrom, in trust or otherwise, to persons or corporations, within the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), in the following cases:

First. When the transfer is by will or by the intestate laws of any State or Territory or of the United States from any person dying seized or possessed of the property while a resident of the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands).

Second. When the transfer is by will or intestate law of property within the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), and the decedent was a nonresident of the United States or any of its possessions at the time of his death.

Third. Whenever the property of a resident decedent, or the property of a nonresident decedent within the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), transferred by will, is not specifically bequeathed or devised, such property shall, for the purpose of this section, be deemed to be transferred proportionately to, and divided pro rata among, all the general legatees and devisees named in said decedent's will, including all transfers under a residuary clause of such will.

Fourth. When the transfer is of property made by a resident, or by a nonresident when such nonresident's property is within the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands), by deed, grant, bargain, sale, or gift made in contemplation of the death of the grantor, vendor, or donor or intended to take effect in possession or enjoyment at or after such death.

Fifth. When any such person or corporation becomes beneficially entitled, in possession or expectancy, to any property or the income thereof by any such transfer, whether made before or after the passage of this act.

Sixth. Whenever any person or corporation shall exercise a power of appointment derived from any disposition of property made either before or after the passage of this act, such appointment when made shall be deemed a transfer taxable under the provisions of this act in the same manner as though the property to which such appointment relates belonged absolutely to the donee of such power and had been bequeathed or devised by such donee by will; and whenever any person or corporation possessing such power of appointment so derived shall omit or fail to exercise the same within the time provided therefor, in whole or in part, a transfer taxable under the provisions of this act shall be deemed to take place to the extent of such omission or failure, in the same manner as though the persons or corporations thereby becoming entitled to the possession or enjoyment of the property to which such power related had succeeded thereto by a will of the donee of the power failing to exercise such power, taking effect at the time of such omission or failure.

Seventh. The tax imposed hereby shall be, except as otherwise prescribed in paragraph 2 of this section, as follows:

If such property, real or personal, or any interest therein so transferred, is of the value of less than \$5,000, at the rate of 1 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; if of the value of \$5,000 and not exceeding \$50,000, at the rate of 2 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; if exceeding \$50,000 and not exceeding \$250,000, at the rate of 5 per cent upon the clear market value thereof; if exceeding \$250,000 and not exceeding \$750,000, at the rate of 10 per cent upon the clear market value thereof; if exceeding \$750,000 and not exceeding \$1,500,000, at the rate of 15 per cent upon the clear market value thereof; if exceeding \$1,500,000 and not exceeding \$3,000,000, at the rate of 20 per cent upon the clear market value thereof; if exceeding \$3,000,000 and not exceeding \$7,000,000 in value, at the rate of 25 per cent upon the clear market value thereof; if exceeding \$7,000,000 and not exceeding \$15,000,000 in value, at the rate of 40 per cent upon the clear market value thereof; and if of the value of over \$15,000,000, at the rate of 50 per cent upon the clear market value thereof.

PAR. 2. That when property, real or personal, or any beneficial interest therein, of the value of less than \$25,000 passes by any such transfer to or for the use of any father, mother, husband, wife, child, brother, sister, wife, or widow of a son or the husband of a daughter, or any child or children adopted as such in conformity with the laws of any State, Territory, or of the United States—in which such person shall at the time of such transfer reside—of the decedent, grantor, donor, or vendor, or to any child to whom any such decedent, grantor, donor, or vendor, for not less than 10 years prior to such transfer stood in the mutually acknowledged relation of a parent: *Provided, however,* That such relationship began at or before the child's fifteenth birthday and was continuous for said 10 years thereafter: *And provided also,* That, except in the case of a stepchild, the parents of such child shall be deceased when such relationship commenced, or to any lineal descendant of such decedent, grantor, donor, or vendor born in lawful wedlock, such transfer of property shall not be taxable under this section; if real or personal property, or any beneficial interest therein, so transferred is of the value of \$25,000 and not exceeding \$50,000, it shall be taxable under this section at the rate of 1 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; if exceeding \$50,000 and not exceeding \$250,000, it shall be taxable under this section at the rate of 2 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; if exceeding \$250,000 and not exceeding \$500,000, it shall be taxable under this section at the rate of 3 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; if exceeding \$500,000 and not exceeding \$1,000,000, it shall be taxable under this section at the rate of 4 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; if exceeding \$1,000,000 and not exceeding \$5,000,000, it shall be taxable under this section at the rate of 7 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; if exceeding \$5,000,000 and not exceeding \$10,000,000, it shall be taxable under this section at the rate of 15 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; if exceeding \$10,000,000 and not exceeding \$20,000,000, it shall be taxable under this section at the rate of 25 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; if exceeding \$20,000,000 and not exceeding \$30,000,000, it shall be taxable under this section at the rate of 35 per cent upon the clear market value of such property; and if exceeding \$30,000,000, it shall be taxable under this section at the rate of 50 per cent upon the clear market value of such property. But any property devised or bequeathed to any purely educational, charitable, missionary, benevolent, hospital, or infirmity corporation, including corporations organized exclusively for Bible or tract purposes, shall be exempted from and not subject to the provisions of this section. There shall also be exempted from and not subject to the provisions of this section personal property, other than money or securities, bequeathed to a corporation or association organized exclusively for the moral or mental improvement of men or women, or for scientific, literary, library, patriotic, cemetery, or historical purposes, or for the enforcement of laws relating to children or animals, or for two or more of such purposes, and used exclusively for carrying out one or more of such purposes. But no such corporation or association shall be entitled to such exemption if any officer, member, or employee thereof shall receive or may be lawfully entitled to receive any pecuniary profit from the operations thereof except reasonable compensation for services in effecting one or more of such purposes or as proper beneficiaries of its strictly charitable purposes; or if the organization thereof for any such avowed purpose be a guise or pretense for directly or indirectly making any other pecuniary profit for such corporation or association or for any of its members or employees; or if it be not in good faith organized or conducted exclusively for one or more of such purposes.

PAR. 3. That if such tax is paid within six months from the accrual thereof a discount of 5 per cent shall be allowed and deducted therefrom. If such tax is not paid within 18 months from the accrual thereof, interest shall be charged and collected thereon at the rate of 10 per cent per annum from the time the tax accrued, unless by reason of claims made upon the estate, necessary litigation, or other unavoidable cause of delay such tax can not be determined and paid as herein provided, in which case interest at the rate of 6 per cent per annum shall be charged upon such tax from the accrual thereof until the cause of such delay is removed, after which 10 per cent shall be charged.

PAR. 4. That the tax or duty aforesaid shall be due and payable in two years after the death of the testator, and shall be a lien and charge upon the property of every person who may die as aforesaid for 20 years or until the same shall, within that period, be fully paid to and discharged by the United States; and every executor, administrator, or trustee having in charge or trust any legacy or distributive share as aforesaid shall give notice thereof, in writing, to the collector or deputy collector of the district where the deceased grantor or bargainer last resided within 30 days after he shall have taken charge of such trust, and every executor, administrator, or trustee, before payment and distribution to the legatees or any parties entitled to beneficial interest therein, shall pay to the collector or deputy collector of the district of which the deceased person was a resident, or in which the property was located in case of nonresidents, the amount of the duty or tax assessed upon such legacy or distributive share, and shall also make and render to the said collector or deputy collector a schedule, list, or statement, in duplicate, of the amount of such legacy or distributive share, together with the amount of duty which has accrued or shall accrue thereon, verified by his oath or affirmation, to be administered and certified thereon by some magistrate or officer having lawful power to administer such oaths in such form and manner as may be prescribed by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, which schedule, list, or statement shall contain the names of each and every person entitled to any beneficial interest therein, together with the clear value of such interest, the duplicate of which schedule, list, or statement shall be by him immediately delivered and the tax thereon paid to such collector; and

upon such payment and delivery of such schedule, list, or statement said collector or deputy collector shall grant to such person paying such duty or tax a receipt or receipts for the same in duplicate, which shall be prepared as hereinafter provided. Such receipt or receipts, duly signed and delivered by such collector or deputy collector, shall be sufficient evidence to entitle such executor, administrator, or trustee to be credited and allowed such payment by every tribunal which by the laws of any State or Territory is or may be empowered to decide upon and settle the accounts of executors and administrators. And in case such executor, administrator, or trustee shall refuse or neglect to pay the aforesaid duty or tax to the collector or deputy collector as aforesaid within the time hereinbefore provided, or shall neglect or refuse to deliver to said collector or deputy collector the duplicate of the schedule, list, or statement of such legacies, property, or personal estate, under oath as aforesaid, or shall neglect or refuse to deliver the schedule, list, or statement of such legacies, property, or personal estate, under oath as aforesaid, or shall deliver to said collector or deputy collector a false schedule or statement of such legacies, property, or personal estate, or give the names and relationship of the persons entitled to beneficial interests therein untruly or shall not truly and correctly set forth and state therein the clear value of such beneficial interests, or where no administration upon such property or personal estate shall have been granted or allowed under existing laws, the collector or deputy collector shall make out such lists and valuation as in other cases of neglect or refusal and shall assess the duty thereon, and the collector shall commence appropriate proceedings before any court of the United States, in the name of the United States, against such person or persons as may have the actual or constructive custody or possession of such property or personal estate, or any part thereof, and shall subject such property or personal estate, or any portion of the same, to be sold upon the judgment or decree of such court, and from the proceeds of such sale the amount of such tax or duty, together with all costs and expenses of every description to be allowed by such court, shall be first paid, and the balance, if any, deposited according to the order of such court, to be paid under its direction to such person or persons as shall establish title to the same. The deed or deeds or any proper conveyance of such property or personal estate, or any portion thereof, so sold under such judgment or decree executed by the officer lawfully charged with carrying the same into effect shall vest in the purchaser thereof all the title of the delinquent to the property or personal estate sold under and by virtue of such judgment or decree, and shall release every other portion of such property or personal estate from the lien or charge thereon created by this section. And every person who shall have in his possession, charge, or custody any record, file, or paper containing, or supposed to contain, any information concerning such property or personal estate, as aforesaid, passing from any person who may die as aforesaid, shall exhibit the same at the request of the collector or deputy collector of the district and to any law officer of the United States in the performance of his duty under this section, his deputy or agent, who may desire to examine the same. And if any such person having in his possession, charge, or custody any such records, files, or paper shall refuse or neglect to exhibit the same on request, as aforesaid, he shall forfeit and pay the sum of \$500: *Provided*, That in all legal controversies where such deed or title shall be the subject of judicial investigation, the recital in said deed shall be prima facie evidence of its truth and that the requirements of the law have been complied with by the officers of the Government: *And provided further*, That in case of willful neglect, refusal, or false statement by such executor, administrator, or trustee, as aforesaid, he shall be liable to a penalty of not exceeding \$1,000, to be recovered with costs of suit. Any tax paid under the provisions of this section shall be deducted from the particular legacy or distributive share on account of which the same is charged.

PAR. 5. That from and after the passage of this act the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the recommendation of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, is authorized to appoint a competent person, at an annual salary of \$5,000, whose special duty it shall be to conduct such investigations as may be necessary to secure the efficient enforcement of the tax imposed upon legacies and distributive shares of personal property by this section, and the Commissioner of Internal Revenue may also from time to time assign one or more special agents to aid in such investigations.

PAR. 6. That in all States having a local inheritance-tax law the amount of such local inheritance tax shall be deducted from the normal amount to be collected under the provisions of this section.

Mr. BRANDEGEE submitted five amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PANAMA CANAL EQUIPMENT.

Mr. POINDEXTER submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 169), which was read:

Resolved, That the Isthmian Canal Commission be, and they are hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate information showing as nearly as may be practicable the amount, character, and value of construction machinery, equipment, and material which will be available on the completion of the Panama Canal and which it would be possible to transfer to Alaska for use in railroad and dock construction and coal mining.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall not object, provided it does not lead to debate. If the Senator will withdraw it in that event I will not make an objection.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think it will lead to any debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Let it be read again.

The Secretary again read the resolution.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I should like to ask the Senator from Washington if the execution of this request would involve any expense?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can not imagine what expense would be involved in it. They have a large, well-organized clerical force, and undoubtedly they have this information already in hand. I imagine that the transmission of the information to the Senate would not involve any expense.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The transmission, of course, would not involve anything but putting a frank on an envelope and mailing it, if they have the information. I assume it will involve going over the whole equipment on the canal in order to ascertain what could be dispensed with and what is necessary, and in that there is something in the nature of an investigation. I would rather have it, if the Senator would not object, provided if it can be done without expense or some limited expense. I am willing to have the resolution passed, if the Senator prefers it, as it is.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I would prefer it the way it is. I do not think it will involve any expense for the reason that those in charge of the construction of the canal undoubtedly have this information in their possession.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I think the resolution ought to distinguish between the entire amount of machinery and equipment which is now upon the canal and the amount which could be dispensed with and moved to Alaska. As I heard it read, it made no such distinction, but asked for a statement of the entire amount there available and which could be transported to Alaska. The whole of it could be transported to Alaska or any other place if we want to spend enough money to get it there. I suppose the idea is to find out what possibly could be taken to Alaska that may not be needed to be retained upon the canal.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The resolution asks for the amount and character that would be available at the finishing of the canal.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The whole of it would be available, would it not?

Mr. POINDEXTER. That is what we are inquiring. I imagine that they have a large amount of machinery and equipment which would not be useful or available for the construction of docks or railroads in Alaska. The very language of the resolution necessarily discriminates between such as would be useful and available for the purposes mentioned and that which would not be.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I see the Senator's point. I do not object to the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 3321.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. LEA].

NATIONAL CONSERVATION EXPOSITION AT KNOXVILLE, TENN.

Mr. LEA. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2065) to provide for participation by the Government of the United States in the National Conservation Exposition to be held at Knoxville, Tenn., in the fall of 1913. A similar measure carrying a larger appropriation than this was passed at the last session.

Mr. SIMMONS. I shall not object, provided it does not lead to debate and if the Senator will withdraw it in that case.

Mr. LEA. I will withdraw it if it leads to debate.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Colt	La Follette	O'Gorman
Bacon	Crawford	Lane	Oliver
Bankhead	Cummins	Lea	Overman
Brady	Fall	Lewis	Owen
Brandeggee	Fletcher	Lippitt	Page
Bristow	Gallinger	Lodge	Perkins
Bryan	Gronna	McCumber	Pittman
Catron	Hughes	McLean	Poinexter
Chamberlain	James	Martin, Va.	Pomerene
Chilton	Johnson	Martine, N. J.	Reed
Clapp	Jones	Myers	Robinson
Clark, Wyo.	Kenyon	Nelson	Saulsbury
Clarke, Ark.	Kern	Norris	Shafer

Sheppard
Sherman
Shields
Shively
Simmons
Smith, Ariz.

Smith, Ga.
Smith, S. C.
Smoot
Sterling
Stone
Sutherland

Swanson
Thomas
Thompson
Tillman
Townsend
Vardaman

Walsh
Warren
Weeks

Mr. JAMES. My colleague [Mr. BRADLEY] is prevented from attendance here by reason of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. KERN]. I will allow this announcement to stand for the day.

Mr. SHEPPARD. My colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] is necessarily absent, and is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2065.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate \$50,000 to enable the Government of the United States and its experiment stations to cooperate with and make an exhibit at the National Conservation Exposition illustrative of the functions of the Government and the experiment stations and their educational value in connection with the development and wise use of the natural resources of the United States, especially the advancement of scientific agriculture and the increase of productivity of the soil through improved cultivation and crop selection and the prevention of avoidable wastes; the reclamation of wet and dry lands by drainage and irrigation, respectively; the more economical development and utilization of mineral wealth; the judicious use of and prevention of needless destruction in woodlands for maintaining timber supply and protecting headwaters of streams; the development and utilization of water power; the use and improvement of inland waterways; the preservation of fish and game; the preservation and protection of life in connection with industrial operations; and the economic investigations and operations of the Government with reference to mines and mining, geology, topographic and other surveys, public roads, rural-life improvement, education, child welfare, and public health and sanitation.

A United States Government board of managers is authorized to be appointed, to be charged with the selection, purchase, preparation, transportation, arrangement, safe-keeping, exhibition, and return of such articles and materials as the heads of the several departments, respectively, decide shall be embraced in the Government exhibit herein authorized. The President of the United States may also designate additional articles of peculiar interest for exhibition in connection with the said Government exhibit. Said Government board of managers shall be composed of three persons now in the employ of the Government and shall be appointed by the President, one of whom shall be designated by the President as chairman of the said board and one as secretary and disbursing officer. The members of said Government board, with other officers and employees of the Government who may be detailed to assist them, including officers of the Army and Navy, shall receive no compensation in addition to their regular salaries, but they shall be allowed their actual and necessary traveling expenses, together with a per diem in lieu of subsistence, to be fixed by the Secretary of the Treasury, while necessarily absent from their homes engaged upon the business of the board. Officers of the Army and Navy shall receive said allowance in lieu of the subsistence and mileage now allowed by law; and the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may, in their discretion, detail retired Army or Navy officers for such duty. Any provisions of law which may prohibit the detail of persons in the employ of the United States to other service than that which they customarily perform shall not apply to persons detailed for duty in connection with said National Conservation Exposition. Employees of the board not otherwise employed by the Government shall be entitled to such compensation as the board may determine, and such employees may be selected and appointed by said board. The disbursing officer shall give bond in such sum as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine for the faithful performance of his duties, said bond to be approved by said Secretary. The Secretary of the Treasury shall advance to said officer from time to time, under such regulations as he may prescribe, a sum of money from the appropriation for the Government exhibit herein authorized, not exceeding at any one time the penalty of his bond, to enable him to pay the expenses of said exhibit as authorized by the United States Government board herein created.

Mr. SMOOT. I merely wish to ask one question of the Senator from Tennessee. I notice the report says:

This committee, having conducted a hearing of the officers of the National Conservation Exposition and others, is of the opinion that the exposition should have the approval of the United States.

I suppose the Senator does not understand that the approval of this exposition by the United States places any responsibility on the Government of the United States further than the appropriation provided for.

Mr. LEA. None in the world; and the bill so provides.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE TARIFF.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3321) to reduce tariff duties and to provide revenue for the Government, and for other purposes.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] for a moment. In the course of my remarks yesterday in connection with the subject of the bounty paid by Australia the Senator from North Carolina had paragraph E of the administrative part of the bill read into my remarks, he claiming that the countervailing duty that is provided for in that paragraph could be used to counteract the payment of the bounty on tops from Australia. I have since given that subject a little more careful examination than I had the opportunity to do when it was first proposed, and if the Senator will read that paragraph he will see that the Secretary of the Treasury is only authorized to act in case the bounty is paid upon the exportation of any article. If the bounty is paid by the Government of Australia for the manufacture of the article, and applies alike to the article, whether it is used in Australia or whether it is exported, as I read the paragraph it would not be effective.

Now, I do not know exactly in what form that bounty is paid. The only information that I had about it was what has appeared in the daily press. I think it is probable that the bounty is paid by the Government of Australia upon tops manufactured. In such case the situation would be as I described it. If, however, it is only paid in case the tops are exported, which I can not imagine is the case, then the position of the Senator from North Carolina would be correct.

I have brought up the subject for two reasons: One as to its effect upon the woolgrower in this country and the other to show the great efforts which some countries make to encourage the very things which I think are being discouraged under the policy which is being inaugurated here. I simply wanted to bring to the attention of the Senate the situation as I understand it.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, my recollection is that before I asked to have the paragraph incorporated in the Senator's remarks, after stating the substance of it, I had asked the Senator from Rhode Island whether he referred to an export duty, and whether that export duty was in the nature of a bounty or otherwise. Of course, this country would have no concern about a bounty paid by a foreign government upon productions in that country unless that bounty was in the nature of a burden upon the exports to this country. If the bounty paid is in the nature of an export duty, or if it is a bounty confined to exports, then, under this paragraph, the amount of that bounty would be added to the duty fixed in this bill upon tops or upon any other dutiable article.

Mr. LIPPITT. The way the Senator from North Carolina describes it and the way I have described it I think are the same. We understand the situation alike.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 295, page 87, line 20, before the words "per cent," to strike out "15" and insert "5," so as to make the paragraph read:

295. Combed wool or tops and roving or roping made wholly or in part of wool or camel's hair, and on other wool and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, not specially provided for in this section, 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator in charge of this schedule of the bill if he will not allow that paragraph to be passed over for the present? I have at my office some figures which I wish to present a little later in the day.

Mr. STONE. Very well; let the paragraph be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over. The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 296, page 87, line 21, before the words "per cent," to strike out "20" and insert "15," so as to make the paragraph read:

296. Yarns made wholly or in chief value of wool, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, on yesterday during the debate it was intimated that an alleged flood of foreign goods came into this country after the enactment of the Wilson tariff law. One would think that the lowering of the tariff rate by that law led to a great increase in importations. I wish to call attention to the exact figures.

Under the McKinley tariff law, which was enacted in 1890, the largest amount of importations free of duty was in 1892, and their total amount was \$458,000,000 in round numbers. At no time during the operation of the Wilson tariff law did the imports free of duty reach that amount.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator from Texas mean \$458,000,000 or 458,000,000 pounds?

Mr. SHEPPARD. The value of the goods imported free of duty in 1892 under the McKinley law was \$458,000,000 in round numbers.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator means of all imports?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; of all imports admitted free of duty. I will give the imports subject to duty in a moment.

The highest value of imports free of duty was reached in 1892 under the McKinley law and was \$458,000,000, in round numbers. The amounts free of duty under the Wilson law were as follows, in round numbers: In 1894, \$378,000,000; in 1895, \$376,000,000; in 1896, \$368,000,000; and in 1897, \$381,000,000.

The amount of dutiable imports under the McKinley law reached the highest value in 1891, and that value was \$466,000,000, in round numbers. At no time during the operation of the Wilson law did the imports of goods subject to duty reach that amount or anything like it.

The amount of imports subject to duty under the Wilson law were, in round numbers, in 1894, \$257,000,000; in 1895, \$354,000,000; in 1896, \$390,000,000; and in 1897, \$407,000,000.

I think these figures will speak for themselves.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, my attention was called away when paragraph 296, the short paragraph, was read, and I think that ought to go over with the paragraph relative to yarns or tops.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming asks that paragraph 296 be passed over with the preceding paragraph. I understand he wishes that paragraph passed over only temporarily.

Mr. WARREN. Only temporarily, so far as I am concerned. I want to make a very few remarks, and I have some figures that are at my office which I should like to give a little later in the day.

Mr. STONE. As I understand the Senator, it will not delay us in going on with the rest of the schedule?

Mr. WARREN. I am speaking only on my own account. I merely wish to delay the consideration of the paragraph a short time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I did not understand what object the Senator from Texas [Mr. SHEPPARD] had in quoting the figures of importations under the McKinley law.

Mr. SHEPPARD. It was intimated in the Chamber on yesterday that the lower rates of the Wilson law had caused a flood of foreign goods to enter this country; that they had caused an increase in the importations.

Mr. SMOOT. All that was said yesterday, as I remember, was that the Wilson law caused a flood of woolen goods and wastes to come into this country, and that is the absolute truth. More woolen goods and more wool waste entered the United States under the Wilson law than at any former time in our history for the same length of time. The Senator from Texas is quoting the amount of importations of all goods that were upon the free list. Why, Mr. President, under the present law the goods coming into this country free have, I suppose, reached the largest proportion under any law since a tariff bill was first enacted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I also gave the value of goods imported subject to duty.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, Mr. President; and under the present law 51 per cent and a fraction of all the goods imported into this country come in free.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I understand that, but I say I also gave the value of the goods that came into this country subject to a duty under the Wilson law, and they were smaller in volume than the importations under the McKinley law subject to a duty.

Mr. SMOOT. Certainly, Mr. President; because people at that time did not have the purchasing power that they previously had; and not only that—

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did they have it as to woolen goods?

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I appeal to both Senators to know if they do not think that this debate has at least a very

remote connection with the matter that we now have immediately before the Senate.

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President, it has an immediate connection with it.

Mr. STONE. I think that we ought to go on and make a little progress.

Mr. SMOOT. Another thing I want to say to the Senator from Missouri is that I do not think that he ought to be impatient, because I have said very little upon this schedule so far. The Senator from Texas made a statement to refute a statement made yesterday, and that statement—

Mr. STONE. I admit that the Senator from Texas has started the ball rolling, but I hope the Senator from Utah will not keep pushing it along.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the Senator from Utah has made but three speeches of three hours each on this matter, I think he ought to be permitted to proceed.

Mr. SMOOT. I am very thankful to the Senator from Kentucky for suggesting such a thing.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I want to say that I am not disturbed in the slightest by the statement of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] to the effect that Senators are trying to take up time. I have taken up less time than almost any other Senator; and if I have anything to say, I propose to say it, regardless of any insinuations that may be offered here. I had a contribution which I thought was worthy of being made in this debate, and so I made it, as I propose to make any other, if I think it worthy. It is a matter of indifference to me what Senators may think about it.

Mr. SMOOT. All I want to do is to keep the record straight, and I would have been through long, long before this time if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] had not interrupted.

I simply desire to say, Mr. President, that the statement made yesterday was that under the Wilson law there was a flood of importations into this country of wastes and of woolen goods; and I say that that is absolutely the truth and that the figures of the Treasury Department will so prove.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, does the Senator claim that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] did not on yesterday give the impression that under the operation of the Wilson law there was a general paralysis of industries in this country, and that practically all the manufacturing business of this country was turned over to foreign manufacturers? Did he not make a direct statement of that character in the course of his speech?

Mr. SMOOT. I do not know whether it was a direct statement, but I assume that that is what he said and what he meant; and so far as the woolen business is concerned it is true.

Mr. HUGHES. In the absence of the Senator from Pennsylvania I do not like to attempt to quote him. I can only say—

Mr. SMOOT. I think he was referring particularly to the woolen industry.

Mr. HUGHES. The impression made upon me was that he was referring to the condition of every industry in this country at that period.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, he was speaking on the woolen schedule; he was referring to woolen goods; and he spoke of the woolen business. The Senator must remember that several Senators referred to the immense increase in the importation of wastes and woolen goods during the 3 years and 8 months of the operation of the Wilson law over any period in the history of the United States. The importation of such goods during the 3 years and 8 months of the operation of the Wilson law was nearly twenty times more than for the 13 years since that time.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Was that due to the smaller purchasing power of the people and to panicky conditions?

Mr. SMOOT. No matter how hard times may be, people must have clothing; the law compels them to wear clothes; and, of course, if all of our clothing manufactures are virtually paralyzed the people have to get goods from some other part of the world.

Mr. SHEPPARD. But when I showed that all importations subject to duty came in under the Wilson law in less amount than under the McKinley law the Senator says it was due to the fact that the purchasing power of the people had been diminished. If the purchasing power was diminished as to all other goods, why was it not diminished also as to woolen goods? It makes no difference whether or not the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania was true as to woolen goods, the fact remains that the enactment of the Wilson law did not on the whole

cause a great increase of importations and a flood of foreign goods into this country.

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator would only study this question and find out what the American production was during those years, what the foreign importations were, and add them together, he would find that the purchasing power of the people was restricted.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Why did they buy so much more woolen goods, then?

Mr. SMOOT. They did not buy more woolen goods.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The Senator has just said that they bought more.

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, they bought more foreign woolen goods, but they did not buy nearly as many American-made goods. The production in this country fell off immensely.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Where are your figures?

Mr. SMOOT. I can give them to the very pound, if the Senator desires.

I rose simply to correct a statement made here in relation to the woolen-goods industry in this country, and I shall let it rest at that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Chair understand that by agreement concurrence in the committee amendment to paragraph 296 is to be set aside?

Mr. JAMES. I understood the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] to request that the paragraph be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph goes over; but the Chair wants to have the record straight, and desires to know whether, by agreement, concurrence in the committee amendment to that paragraph is to be set aside?

Mr. THOMAS. I will inquire of the Senator from Wyoming what is his understanding?

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, there need not be any misunderstanding. Paragraph 296 depends very much on the paragraph which precedes it. If any change should be made in paragraph 295, it would involve a change in paragraph 296. Of course, I may say that Senators on the other side ought not to get frightened, fearing immediate changes. I myself am not fearing that any change will be made; but I should like to submit some reasons why there should, in justice, be a change.

Mr. THOMAS. Perhaps the Senator did not understand the inquiry of the Chair. We are not frightened at all up to this time.

Mr. WARREN. I was not certain that the amendment had been adopted, my attention being diverted at the time.

Mr. THOMAS. We are quite willing that the paragraph shall go over as though the amendment had not been acted upon at all.

Mr. WARREN. I understood that the two paragraphs were to be passed over for the present, to be taken up later.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the inquiry of the Chair is as to whether the paragraphs being passed over concurrence in the committee amendment in paragraph 296 is to be set aside, or whether the action on that amendment is to stand and then the paragraph go over?

Mr. WARREN. The paragraph ought to go over, but I do not care to make any motion to reconsider the amendment, although much depends on the preceding paragraph. I think the Senator from Missouri understood that they were both to lie over together. When we return to them, they can be taken up in whatever condition they may then be in.

Mr. STONE. I understood the Senator to say that his attention was diverted when the committee amendment in paragraph 296 was agreed to, without debate or any suggestion in regard to it, and he immediately stated that he would like to have paragraph 296 passed over, along with the preceding paragraph, and that both should be taken up together. I will state that I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then, the Chair understands that the paragraph goes over as though the amendment were not agreed to?

Mr. STONE. Oh, well, it is immaterial.

Mr. WARREN. It does not make any difference either way. The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 297, page 87, line 26, after the words "ad valorem," to insert "cloths if made in chief value of cattle hair or horse hair, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem; stockings, hose and half hose, made on knitting machines or frames, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; stockings, hose and half hose, selvedged, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, including such as are commercially known as seamless stockings, hose and half hose, and clocked

stockings, hose and half hose, all of the above, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, if valued at not more than \$1.20 per dozen pairs, 30 per cent ad valorem; if valued at more than \$1.20 per dozen pairs, 50 per cent ad valorem; press cloth composed of camel's hair, 10 per cent ad valorem," so as to make the paragraph read:

297. Cloths, knit fabrics, felts not woven, and all manufactures of every description made, by any process, wholly or in chief value of wool, not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem; cloths if made in chief value of cattle hair or horse hair, not specially provided for in this section, 25 per cent ad valorem; stockings, hose and half hose, made on knitting machines or frames, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, not specially provided for in this section, 20 per cent ad valorem; stockings, hose and half hose, selvedged, fashioned, narrowed, or shaped wholly or in part by knitting machines or frames, or knit by hand, including such as are commercially known as seamless stockings, hose and half hose, and clocked stockings, hose and half hose, all of the above, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, if valued at not more than \$1.20 per dozen pairs, 30 per cent ad valorem; if valued at more than \$1.20 per dozen pairs, 50 per cent ad valorem; press cloth composed of camel's hair, 10 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that in the case of a particular kind of cloth called casket cloth, owing to the way it is made up abroad, the effect of the use of the words "wholly or in chief value of wool" will be to throw it into the cotton schedule with 15 per cent duty.

I shall not undertake to argue the case at any length, but I desire to print a statement that relates to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEPONSET WOOLEN MILLS,
Canton Junction, Mass., May 29, 1913.

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I own a woolen mill at Canton Junction, Mass., making cloth (sometimes called "faced unions") for covering caskets and coffins.

I have just discovered that I shall be put out of business on account of the wording of the new tariff bill in Schedule K, paragraph 270, "Cloths, knit fabrics, felts not woven, and all manufactures of every description made, by any process, wholly or in chief value of wool not especially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem." The particular phrase in this paragraph is, "wholly or in chief value of wool." These words throw 70 per cent of my production into Schedule I, paragraph 257. This leaves a protection of 12½ per cent on account of being a dyed fabric—total protection, 15 per cent.

Our particular fabric—known under the name of casket cloth—can not be used for any purpose other than the covering of coffins, the machinery to produce it being brought over from England, the duty for it being a dyed fabric—total protection, 15 per cent.

The cloth is made with a cotton warp and a low woolen yarn for filling, the latter having a varying percentage of cotton waste. It is also necessary to add a proportion of new cotton to help the spinning.

The cost of labor is very high, owing to the great amount of work essential to obtain a finished appearance equal to the highest grade of imported broadcloths. The foreign manufacturers are past masters at this kind of work and get an appearance even better than ours. They are also expert manipulators, and will be able to have the chief value cotton and have their goods passed under the cotton schedule.

Most manufacturers are able to push their sales and help out on an increased production, thereby reducing the manufacturing cost. I can not ask people to die and thus increase my sales, and my machinery is not adapted to the manufacture of other lines of cloth, and prices are cut low. I am obliged to sell goods 2 yards wide at 37 cents per yard, and 70 per cent of my business is at this price.

I respectfully ask that, under the special conditions and high cost of production, you will give me the woolen protection, either by changing the paragraph mentioned or by a special clause that will put casket cloths and faced unions into the woolen schedule.

Yours, very truly,

JNO. W. WRIGHT.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, just a word in connection with that item. What the Senator from Massachusetts has said is well taken. The casket cloths are composed mostly of cotton, mixed with the finest kind of wool and wool waste.

Mr. LODGE. Low-grade woolen yarns.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. The reason of that is that they are not designed to stand wear, but they have to be highly finished face goods.

Mr. LODGE. They have to be finished like broadcloth.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes. While there is considerable wool in it, it is mostly on the face. This cloth will fall in the cotton schedule, as the Senator says.

Mr. LODGE. I will add that it requires special machinery, which has to be imported.

Mr. SMOOT. They are very highly finished goods, and a great deal of labor is required to face-finish them.

Mr. LODGE. That is true.

I also wish to call attention to the fact that the effect of this amendment, as I understand it, will be to give to the heavy stockings a measure of protection, but just the reverse in the case of the light stockings. I think the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN] has figures which show that.

Mr. McLEAN. What paragraph is the Senator referring to?

Mr. LODGE. I am speaking now of the amendment in paragraph 297, page 88, dealing with the question of stockings. I

say that I think the Senator has figures there to show that for the heavy stockings some protection is given, but with the same kind of stockings of light weight the reverse is true.

Mr. MCLEAN. I think the same principle applies to hose that applies to knitted underwear. It was my purpose to call the attention of the Committee on Finance to the same lack of logic in the rate on knitted wear in paragraph 300.

Mr. LODGE. Very well; then I will let it go until that paragraph is reached.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I desire to say at this point that it is probable that a little later an amendment will be offered to this paragraph, following the amendment just agreed to, with a view to covering woolen gloves as woolen hose are covered in this paragraph. That amendment is not proposed now, however. I am merely stating that the probability is that it will be offered.

Mr. SMOOT. That would take them out of paragraph 300, in which they now fall?

Mr. LODGE. Yes.

Mr. MCLEAN. The same principle is involved in paragraph 300.

Mr. LODGE. The amendment suggested by the Senator from Missouri would take out the articles for which the Senator from Connecticut has the figures and put them in here, where I suppose they belong, because it is the combination of dozens and weight that makes the difficulty.

Mr. MCLEAN. Do I understand from the Senator from Missouri that the committee will consider that the same principle is involved in paragraph 300?

Mr. STONE. Yes. As I understand, woolen gloves would fall under the 35 per cent duty provided in paragraph 300. If they should be classified specially in paragraph 297, with a definite rate applying to them, of course it would take them out of paragraph 300, since they would be specially provided for.

Mr. MCLEAN. I simply wish to call the attention of the Senator to the fact that the same principle applies equally to the knitted underwear, the lighter weights receiving no protection at all under the flat rate of 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. STONE. That is another question. I was merely advising the Senate that a particular amendment probably would be proposed. Of course we can take it up when we reach it.

Mr. MCLEAN. If the Senator says he will take under consideration all the products involved in that section, I have nothing more to say. Otherwise, I should like to call the attention of the committee to the matter.

Mr. STONE. I do not know what the Senator means by taking them under consideration. The committee has had them under consideration.

Mr. MCLEAN. I will explain to the Senator what I mean. Perhaps I may as well do it now as later.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator wish to address himself now to paragraph 300?

Mr. MCLEAN. Paragraph 300; yes.

Mr. STONE. Why not wait until we get to it?

Mr. MCLEAN. Very well.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 298, page 88, line 16, after the word "Blankets," to insert "not specially provided for in this section," so as to read:

298. Blankets not specially provided for in this section, and flannels, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, 25 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 298, page 88, line 18, after the words "ad valorem," to strike out "flannels composed wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at above 50 cents per pound, 35 per cent ad valorem."

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of this part of the bill the reason for striking out the end of that paragraph, which, in effect, gives flannels valued at over 50 cents per pound 25 per cent duty, whereas similar woolen goods are given 35 per cent duty. In the very next paragraph women's and children's dress goods are given a duty of 35 per cent and woolen cloths generally are given a duty of 35 per cent.

Many of these flannels costing over 50 cents a pound are exactly similar to the women's dress goods, except that they have been napped a little; and in many cases the napping is so slight that it is almost impossible to determine whether the piece of goods is a flannel or otherwise. It seems to me, without meaning to question in any way the thoroughness of the committee's research, that they scarcely could have been thoroughly posted in all the great variety of fabrics that will be

affected by this change, and that will be put upon an entirely different footing from other similar goods.

I have here a number of samples that are very interesting as illustrating that point; and I really should like to know just what the committee had in mind when they made the change.

Mr. STONE. The committee had this in mind: Flannels are in universal use as articles of comfort and necessity, and because they are articles necessary to comfort we felt that a duty of 25 per cent ad valorem was a sufficient duty to be levied upon them. We have put on the free list blankets valued at less than 40 cents a pound, and we felt that as a revenue duty this was sufficient.

I have not considered the matter at all from a protective point of view as far as I am concerned. So far as my poor labor goes, I have not been engaged in making a protective tariff, but a revenue tariff, as I understand. But even from the protective standpoint, I should say that the duty left here is adequate.

Mr. LIPPITT. The Senator in his remarks speaks of these goods as though they partook of the nature of blankets. I think if he will glance even for a second at the fabrics I have here he will see—

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator that I suppose we did not have those exact samples before us, but we had numerous samples of like kind.

Mr. LIPPITT. Certainly the Senator does not think there is any relation between a blanket and that very delicate and fine piece of dress goods [exhibiting sample].

Mr. STONE. Oh, I do not think blankets are made of that flannel; but I think those flannels keep people warm in the winter when they are going about, as blankets keep them warm in the winter when they are in bed.

Mr. LIPPITT. That is entirely true of every piece of cloth in the entire schedule. What I am trying to point out to the Senator is that under this bill whereas he puts on one piece of cloth that keeps people warm, men's wear goods, a duty of 35 per cent, and he puts on another piece of cloth that keeps women warm, women's dress goods, in the very next paragraph, a duty of 35 per cent, in the case of all these exactly similar pieces of goods, which, if they had not happened to be put through a napping machine for the purpose of giving them a rough face, would also pay a duty of 35 per cent, because that additional labor has been put upon them, he puts a duty of only 25 per cent upon them, and gives as a reason that the revenue is not needed; but he does not say why if it is not needed in one case it is needed in the other exactly comparative case. Now he speaks about these things as though they were blankets.

Mr. STONE. No; I did not. The Senator is too much accustomed to saying offensive things of that kind.

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President, the Senator from Missouri is not entirely free from the charge of saying offensive things. I have a very distinct recollection of a case very recently when he went out of his way to say them. I wish to say that if stating the facts hurts the Senator's sensitive feelings, I can not help it. I should think he would be sensitive.

Mr. STONE. The Senator always provokes the retorts to which he now objects. If he would behave himself, perhaps he would not have so much occasion to be chastised.

Mr. LIPPITT. I will not go into the relative habits of the Senator from Missouri and myself.

We were discussing the question of whether the Senator did or did not use an expression from which it could be fairly inferred that he had blankets in mind. I may have misunderstood him. I can only say that that was the inference which I drew from it.

Of course, I know the Senator has at his back the votes necessary to make this change, but I felt that I could not let the matter go by without pointing out the relative injustice of it. I am not talking about whether he is making a protective tariff or what kind of a tariff it is; but at all events, whatever principle it is made upon, it ought to be a consistent tariff. What I have particularly in mind, which I think is perfectly evident to anybody who will examine these fabrics, is that, so far as that particular amendment goes, it is not consistent.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, let us have a vote.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I wish to say that, in my judgment, it is absolutely consistent. Of course, if we were making a tariff for protection, then the rule of consistency would be different from the rule of consistency when you are making a tariff for revenue on the one hand, and on the other hand, a tariff to relieve the people from unnecessary burdens upon the essential things of life.

Mr. President, there are no two articles manufactured in this country that are so essential to the comfort and the health of

people as blankets and flannels. The Senator has very well said the blanket is to keep people warm at night. There is absolutely no substitute for it. The flannel is essential to keep people warm during the day. In making this tariff we considered that fact.

It was not necessary that we should make the tariff upon blankets and flannels identical with the tariff upon ready-made clothing. There is nothing in the theory of a tariff for revenue which requires that sort of consistency. We considered in the question of consistency the question of revenue and the question of the necessity of the people.

If you consider it from the standpoint of consistency, applying the protection theory, I notice here that the average ad valorem duty imposed by the present law upon ready-made clothing is somewhat higher than that imposed upon blankets.

I discover that in 1910 the average was 81.33 per cent on ready-made clothing and in 1912 79.56 per cent on ready-made clothing, while the tariff upon blankets in 1912 was only 72.69 per cent. But that, I say, is unimportant from our standpoint.

If the Senator will look at the revenue derived from these two articles under the present law he will see another reason why we saw fit to make a heavier reduction in the duty on blankets than in the duty on ready-made clothing. As I said, they are very nearly the same under the present law, though a little higher, about 7 points higher, on ready-made clothing than on blankets. If the Senator will examine the bracket under the head of blankets he will discover that last year under the present rate of duty there was imported into this country only \$52,000 worth of blankets, and the revenue received by the Government was only \$37,000. It was a prohibitive duty in effect. He will discover in the next bracket, under the head of flannels, that the amount of importations last year was only \$123,000 worth, and the Government realized only \$120,000 in revenue. If he will examine the bracket with reference to ready-made clothing, however, he will discover that last year under the duties now imposed the importations amounted to \$2,191,000 and the revenue received was \$1,742,000.

Therefore, from the revenue standpoint, we did not see the same necessity for a heavy cut in the duty on clothing that we saw in the duty on blankets, because the one was prohibitive and the other was not; the one yielded considerable revenue and the other practically none. We have so adjusted these duties that they will in our judgment produce revenue to the Government, as well as give the people of this country two of the prime necessities of health, comfort, and happiness at a cheaper rate.

Mr. LIPPITT. I am very glad to know the reasons why in the Senator's mind the duty was changed upon blankets. But the Senator perhaps misunderstands the situation I have presented. I have not said a single word about the duty upon blankets.

Mr. SIMMONS. I spoke of blankets and flannels, and I understood the Senator to be speaking about the paragraph on blankets and flannels. They are both in the same paragraph and at the same rate of duty.

Mr. LIPPITT. What I have been trying to call to the Senator's attention was that a large number of the flannel fabrics that cost more than 50 cents a pound have no relation to blankets at all. If my inference from the Senator's remarks was correct that he was speaking of flannels used as underwear, then those fabrics have no relation to flannels of that kind. They are neither blankets for keeping people warm at night nor underwear for keeping them warm in the daytime. They are dress goods, outside garments, exactly the same as are described in the next paragraph as women's and children's dress goods, except that they have been put through a napping machine and have a little different face.

So far as I understand, however, the Senator is not interested in the protective features of the bill and he is discussing it from a revenue standpoint. But if that fabric had not been put through a napping machine it would have been no more nor less apt to be imported than though it had been, and the revenue from it would be a duty of 35 per cent. But when the duty is 35 per cent in one case and 25 per cent in the other, manifestly we will not get the same revenue from the fabric as though it paid the 35 per cent of all its sister fabrics.

I do not care to continue the discussion further. I think I have expressed—

Mr. SIMMONS. Neither do I. Let us have a vote.

Mr. LIPPITT. I think I have explained the situation. I will say that from the protective standpoint it is one that is of great interest to several of the mills in my section of the country. They do not understand why this one particular fabric that in all the considerations of this bill up to the time it came here have been put upon a parity with other fabrics of the same kind should be singled out in this instance. I felt my-

self that it was due probably to some little misunderstanding of the character of goods that were affected, and I can not say that my mind has been entirely disabused of that idea from the explanations which have been given about it.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, if I understood the Senator from North Carolina, he was making a comparison between the item in paragraphs 297 and 298 and 300. He had reference to ready-made clothing. The thing that struck me as inconsistent in the comparison between paragraphs 298 and 299 was in the one case the duty is 25 per cent evidently upon the same kind of cloth.

Mr. SIMMONS. I am speaking of paragraph 300 and paragraph 298. I did not mention paragraph 299. The figures I quoted—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I know the Senator did not, and that is why I thought the Senators were not discussing the same item.

In the one case the duty is 25 per cent and in the other case it is 35 per cent. I am not familiar enough with it to see why there should be that difference on practically the same class of goods.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not understand the Senator. Does he say the rate in paragraph 299 is different from that in paragraph 300?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No; I am not talking about paragraph 300 at all. I am talking about paragraphs 298 and 299.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand it, the flannels in the portion stricken out by the committee will be made from dress goods in the main.

Mr. LIPPITT. That is the way I understand it. They represent some of the finest and most delicate of the products of the woolen industry.

Mr. LODGE. Exactly; and those dress goods are put at 35 per cent ad valorem, and this particular kind of flannel is put at 25 per cent.

Mr. LIPPITT. This particular kind of dress goods is put at 25 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator certainly understands that paragraph 298 has reference only to the material and paragraph 299 to made-up goods.

Mr. LIPPITT. Certainly not.

Mr. LODGE. Paragraph 299 is not made-up goods.

Mr. LIPPITT. Paragraph 299 applies to these very fabrics, unless they have been napped.

Mr. SIMMONS. I beg pardon.

Mr. LODGE. But the point is that dress goods of a certain kind are put 10 per cent lower than dress goods of another kind. The House had it arranged properly, so far as the classification goes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 300, page 89, line 6, after the word "wool," to insert "or of wool and india rubber," so as to make the paragraph read:

300. Clothing, ready-made, and articles of wearing apparel of every description, including shawls whether knitted or woven, and knitted articles of every description made up or manufactured wholly or in part, and not specially provided for in this section, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, or of wool and india rubber, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. LODGE. Before the amendment is disposed of I wish to call attention to one item that is included in it under the term "articles of wearing apparel of every description." Under that clause what are known as wool hats under the previous law have a duty of 44 cents a pound and 60 per cent ad valorem, making an equivalent ad valorem of 82 per cent. That has been cut down from 82 to 35. Under that 82 44 per cent, which was the equivalent, in the year 1912 there were 87,675 pounds imported as against 9,616 pounds in 1907, the importation rising very rapidly under the present duty. The work is largely handwork. We have to compete with longer hours abroad, child labor, and also with the difficulty of the short season. This reduction is destructive to this industry, which is carried on by small concerns. There are no large concerns in it. They are all small concerns, and they have had a very hard struggle under the present rate.

I merely desire to call attention to this particular injury, as there are some small factories of that kind in my State, and to ask that a fuller statement, which I hold in my hand, may be printed with what I have just said in regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no objection, that will be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

NEW YORK, May 17, 1913.

Hon. HENRY CABOT LODGE,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We desire to record our protest against paragraph 300 of Schedule K of the proposed new tariff act—which replaces paragraph

382 of the present schedule—the effect of which is to reduce the tariff duty on wool hats and wool-hat bodies, finished or partly so, from a specific duty of 44 cents a pound and 60 per cent ad valorem to a flat ad valorem duty of 35 per cent.

Under the present tariff, which was equivalent in the fiscal year 1912 to 82.44 per cent ad valorem (Report of Department of Commerce and Labor, No. 15, p. 81), the number of wool hats entered for consumption during the year ending June 30, 1912, more than trebled the number entered for consumption during the previous fiscal year.

The following statement of importations is taken from the reports on commerce and navigation and the Department of Commerce and Labor, showing the following importations of wool hats from 1907 up to and including the fiscal year 1912:

Year.	Pounds.	Cost.
1907	9,616	\$15,900
1908	32,592	51,363
1909	28,923	49,439
1910	19,557	33,305
1911	19,930	47,145
1912	87,675	171,923

The foreign manufacturer, by reason of his cheaper labor, notwithstanding the present duty, is able to compete in this market with the product of our own mills.

The specific duty of 44 cents a pound on the wool hats imported during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1912, was equivalent to 22.44 per cent ad valorem. (Report of Department of Commerce and Labor.)

The free-wool provision of the pending tariff act would offset this equivalent and justify a reduction of the tariff on wool hats to a 60 per cent ad valorem basis, but it is proposed, without any corresponding offset or equivalent, to cut this duty to 35 per cent ad valorem.

The industry can not survive the reduction.

Approximately 41 per cent of the factory cost of the typical wool hat is made up of direct and indirect labor cost. The division of factory costs is approximately as follows:

	Per cent.
Wool	30
Trimming (band and sweat)	29
Direct labor	26
Indirect labor, including packing, boxing, casing, and other factory costs	15

The work upon the wool hat is largely handwork. Much of the rough labor of hat making abroad is performed by women and is of a character which compels them to work in steam and dust and wet, which would not be tolerated in this country.

The hours of labor in Italy, Germany, and England in the hat industry are very much longer than in this country, and child labor is prevalent, especially in Italy, where the largest wool factories in the world are situated.

In the States in this country in which hat factories are situated 16 years is the allowed age, with many other limitations as to age and sex and hours of labor.

The whole mode of living and surroundings of the people employed in exactly similar work in this country is vastly superior to that which prevails abroad.

Under existing conditions the American manufacturer has been confined to the American market, whereas the foreign manufacturer has freely competed in the markets of the world.

Climatic conditions in this country make a very short season for the sale of wool hats, with the consequence that to maintain a plant and organization on any basis, it has been necessary and is the custom to accumulate between seasons a considerable stock in process of manufacture, hat bodies partly finished, left only to be modeled or blocked or finished and trimmed to meet the requirements of a succeeding season.

It would impose an unreasonable hardship and injustice upon manufacturers to have the tariff law go into immediate effect without an opportunity to dispose of this surplus accumulation and to readjust factory operations to the new tariff conditions.

The wool-hat industry in this country is conducted by individuals, firms, or corporations, none of whom have been formed by consolidation or merger with any other concerns heretofore existing. Such corporations as exist are either family affairs or concerns organized by local subscriptions in towns where they are located. The competition is genuine and keen.

We urge, therefore, that you will use your best efforts to obtain the modification of paragraph 305 to provide for the 50 per cent ad valorem duty, and that in any event in good faith and fair treatment to American manufacturers the time in which the new tariff is to take effect shall allow at least a period of six months for clearances and readjustment.

Yours, very truly,

EMMONS BROS. CO.,
M. EMMONS, President.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE] is absent, and if the chairman of the committee will kindly give me his attention I will endeavor to explain to him what is considered by the knit-goods manufacturers to be a great injustice in this 35 per cent ad valorem duty upon knitted underwear. I have here a comparative statement of the cost in this country and in France and England with regard to knitted underwear. Perhaps I can best explain the point by reading to the Senator a comparison of the cost and the effect of a flat duty with regard to the cost per dozen. In France on, say, style 100, size 40, weight 4 pounds per dozen, cost \$4 per dozen, the duty would be \$1.40, which would make the total cost of the light-weight underwear \$5.45 abroad. In this country the cost is \$7.24 per dozen. When you come to the heavy weights, taking 11 pounds per dozen, the foreign cost would be \$17.13, the duty \$5.99, making the total cost \$23.12. The American cost is \$20.22. Here you will see that there is an adequate protection. But no consideration whatever is paid to the fact that the labor cost in the construction of both the light and heavy weights is practically the same. Consequently the ad valorem flat rate of 35 per cent upon light weight furnishes no protection at all.

I will ask to have this statement put in the Record in order that the committee may take notice of it if they desire to do so. The matter referred to is as follows:

Comparative costs under proposed Wilson tariff bill between foreign and American made men's knit underwear manufactured from worsted and worsted merino yarns.

	Style.	Weight, size 40.	Foreign cost.	Duty.	Total cost.	Cost to manufacturer in America.
French	100	4 pounds	\$4.00	\$1.40	\$5.40	\$7.24
	150/57	5½ pounds	6.30	2.20	8.50	8.67
	250/11	6 pounds 4 ounces	10.62	3.71	14.33	13.66
English	400/13	11 pounds	17.13	5.99	23.12	20.22

The above figures as to the present foreign cost on the four garments mentioned were obtained from a large importer of foreign goods and are prices which prevailed in January, 1913. In figuring the cost of these four garments, if made in America under the present cost of labor, the price of wool was figured on a free-wool basis. The above figures show on their face that the proposed Wilson Underwood bill is not scientific. The lightweight goods could not be made in this country, whereas the heavier goods have a fair protection on them, providing the duty of 35 per cent was actually collected.

Mr. McLEAN. I will not offer an amendment at this time, but unless a change is made I shall offer an amendment when the bill is in the Senate. I want to say to the Senator from North Carolina that I ask it for precisely the same reason that he asked to have the tariff raised on lumber in 1909. He was then, as now, in favor of a tariff for revenue only, and in the debate preceding the fixing of a rate on lumber on April 30, 1909, the Senator from North Carolina used the following language:

The bill under consideration reduces the duty upon rough lumber—that is, sawed board—from \$2 to \$1 per 1,000 feet. The equivalent ad valorem rates are, respectively, about 1 per cent and 53 per cent.

I am opposed to this reduction and in favor of retaining the present duty upon lumber, because the present rate is upon a revenue basis, and because the proposed reduction will probably not reduce the price of lumber to the farmer and the home builder, or, if at all, only slightly and in a comparatively limited area, while it would work great hardship to the lumber industry and the sections of the country in which this industry is conducted by enlarging the market zone of Canada for this product.

I ask the Committee on Finance to put a reasonable protective duty on these goods, because it is a great industry in my State; in the first place, because of the revenue that the Government would derive by it, and, in the next place, because it will not increase the price of the article to the consumer, as stated by the Senator from North Carolina in his opposition to lowering the rate on lumber; and, thirdly, because unless a reasonable protective duty is placed upon this article it will greatly enlarge the market zone for foreign products.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I want to call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut to the fact that under the present law, as is shown by imports entered for consumption for the year ending June 30, 1912, on knit fabrics, not wearing apparel, valued at not more than 40 cents per pound the quantity imported last year was 11½ pounds, the value was \$4, and the revenue \$5.79. The rate of duty was 144.75. Of knit fabrics valued at above 40 and not above 70 cents per pound, the quantity imported was 1,007 pounds, valued at \$658. The duties collected amounted to \$772.08, at an ad valorem duty of 117.44 per cent. Valued above 70 cents per pound the importations were 7,780 pounds, valued at \$8,428, revenue \$8,053.60; average ad valorem equivalent, 95.62.

Mr. McLEAN. I am aware of those figures.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know, Mr. President, what is the difference in the cost of producing this article here and abroad. I have not investigated that. We have not been trying to balance the difference in labor cost here and abroad because we were not trying to make a protective bill. But I imagine that in all the statements we have heard here about the labor cost abroad and the labor cost here are predicated upon the wages paid abroad and the wages paid here. I have made some investigation as to that, and I find that in this country the labor cost of a product does not always depend upon the amount of wages paid, because there is frequently very little relation between the amount of wages per diem per man and the labor cost of a product.

That is true in agriculture and that is true in manufacturing. Farmers paying the same price for labor find at the end of the year that their crops have cost entirely different amounts per unit. One factory paying the same labor cost finds that the labor cost of its product is more than that of another in this country. And so in Europe the amount of wages paid per diem per man does not measure the labor cost of the article.

Mr. McLEAN. If the Senator will pardon me, I do not think he has my point.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not desire to enter into any debate. I was just saying that as incidental to the statement that we had not considered the labor cost in making up this bill. We have not sought to adjust duties upon that basis.

Mr. McLEAN. If it is the purpose of the Senator to give protection to heavyweight goods and to remove protection from lightweight goods, I have nothing more to say. I was calling attention to the fact that it stands to reason—

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, where you adopt a tariff system to apply to different weights and the one is more valuable than the other the ad valorem catches it as a rule.

Mr. McLEAN. But the labor cost is practically the same.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not know as to that. I stated to the Senator that I had not made any investigation about the labor cost, and we have not framed this bill upon that basis.

Mr. McLEAN. I think it is safe to assume that the labor cost would be substantially the same in a lightweight garment as in a heavyweight garment, but no consideration at all is taken of added value because of the material. Why not fix it so that it will bear some semblance of justice?

Mr. SIMMONS. The Senator understands perfectly well that if there is an added value to a thing, if it is dutiable ad valorem, then the ad valorem takes up and catches that additional value.

Mr. McLEAN. That is precisely the point that I am trying to impress upon the Senator. The rate as fixed—35 per cent—does give adequate protection to the heavier weights. The very fact that the value is added appreciates the effect of the ad valorem duty, and the protection is sufficient.

Mr. SIMMONS. Now, the Senator from Connecticut is talking about protection. He says one gives adequate protection and the other does not give adequate protection. I have stated to the Senator that we were not trying to give protection in the duties that we impose here.

Mr. McLEAN. If it is the purpose of the committee to expose one product to competition from precisely the same mill and to give to the other protection, I have nothing more to say.

Mr. SIMMONS. Well, Mr. President, our position does not involve that, as explained by me repeatedly this morning.

Mr. McLEAN. That is the effect of this rate.

Mr. SIMMONS. I do not care to go into it again.

The Senator from Connecticut has referred to my position upon lumber, and in the very beginning of this debate the Senator from Pennsylvania referred to my position upon lumber. I stated then, and I want to state again, that if the Senator from Connecticut and other Senators will read all I said upon that occasion, they will find that my contention was that under the Payne-Aldrich tariff law heavy protective duties were levied and maintained upon nearly all of the things that enter into the cost of production of lumber—upon the ax and the saw with which the tree is felled, upon the carriage with which the log is hauled, upon the iron and steel rail and the engine of the logging road with which it is transported to the mill, upon the machinery in the mill with which it is sawed into boards, upon the tin and the sheet iron in the drying kilns; and my contention was that these protective duties imposed by the Payne-Aldrich law were a burden and a charge upon the cost of manufacturing lumber, and that the manufacturer of lumber should at least be given a rate that would recoup him for the additional cost upon his product imposed by the high duties upon the things that enter into its production.

That was my contention then, and that is my contention now. I said then, "If you will reduce the duties upon the products that enter into the cost of producing lumber, if you will take the duty off of them, then I will vote for free lumber, and do it gladly."

Mr. President, this bill has done practically the very things which I said if done when we were considering the Payne-Aldrich bill I would vote for free lumber. I wish to say again that, in view of that fact, I am going to vote and I have voted for free lumber, and I have done it with a great deal of pleasure.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senator from North Carolina to the fact that the President of the United States, on the 8th day of April, 1913, addressed Congress and said:

It would be unwise to move toward this end headlong, with reckless haste or with strokes that cut at the very roots of what has grown up amongst us by long process and at our own invitation. It does not alter a thing to upset it and break it and deprive it of a chance to change. It destroys it. We must make changes in our fiscal laws, in our fiscal system, whose object is development, a more free and wholesome development, not revolution or upset or confusion.

Mr. President, it was said repeatedly by the President and by the leaders of his party in the campaign that the intention of

this party, if given power, would be to revise the tariff so as not to injure a single legitimate industry, and that those who were attempting to make the people of this country apprehensive that any legitimate industry which, in the language of the President, had grown up according to our own invitation and under our own laws would be injured was an improper attempt on the part of Republicans to distort and misrepresent his position and that of his party.

Now, the Senator from North Carolina, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Finance, stands on the floor of the United States Senate and says that in the make-up of this bill there has been no attempt whatever to even ascertain the difference between the cost of production here and abroad; that there has been no attempt to incorporate a single protective feature in this entire bill; that there has been no attempt to protect any industry that has grown up in this country for the last 40 years under the invitation provided by the laws of the country, the acts of Congress; and that instead of abiding by what the President said in his solemn message to this Congress within four months, of not proceeding to destroy anything, but to make the changes in the fiscal policy of this Government gradual, so that things might be developed and not be upset and reduced to confusion, they boldly state that their intention is to destroy at one swoop the entire system of protection.

If the Democratic Party can consistently claim that this is a wise, discreet, and conservative policy, intended simply to readjust inconsistencies in the existing law, so as not to injure a single legitimate industry, they can turn a more complete somersault than any political party has even succeeded in doing in this country and still retain power.

Mr. THOMAS. And land on their feet.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I have stated that we were not making a protective bill. I had not supposed the Senators on the other side thought we were making a protective bill. I had supposed that they had been assailing this bill on the ground that it was not a protective measure. To say that we have not considered the conditions of an industry would be to say what is not true with reference to the bill. We have considered the conditions of industry, but we have not considered these conditions with the view of making a protective measure on the basis of cost of production.

Mr. President, so far as the President of the United States is concerned, he does not need any defense from me or from any other Senator on this side of the Chamber. There has never been a President of these United States, with the possible exception of one, that the people of this country were so strongly behind as the present Chief Executive of this Nation.

There has never been a man in the White House who enjoyed more fully and more completely the confidence of the people of this country with respect to his ability, to his patriotism, and to his honesty of purpose.

The President of the United States has on various and sundry occasions stated his position with reference to tariff legislation and has made himself perfectly clear. He has not apologized; he has not modified nor retracted anything he has stated. The President of the United States regards, as I happen to know, the bill now pending before the Senate as a fair, just, and full interpretation and expression of his position with reference to the tariff. That being so, Mr. President, I am content; and I am satisfied that Senators on the other side will not be able to show that the President has been at any point inconsistent.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I did not say that the committee or any member thereof had said that they had not considered the industries of this country in the make-up of this bill. So the Senator has set up a man of straw and valiantly conquered him, more or less irrelevantly, in my opinion. What I did say was that I understood the Senator to say, not only to-day but upon a previous occasion, that in the make-up of this bill the majority had not given any consideration whatever to the difference in the cost of production of a commodity in this country and abroad; that their intention was not to equalize the cost of production between an article made in this country and one made abroad nor to equalize the wages paid to labor, but that their contention—

Mr. SIMMONS. The result would be a protection bill if we tried to do that.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Exactly; I have not misunderstood the Senator; he boldly reaffirms what I have stated he said, and which he did not deny. He says that he has made no attempt to make this a protective bill in any respect.

I have not criticized the President of the United States. The Senator has pronounced a glowing panegyric upon the President of the United States. I will, however, say, now that the Senator has called attention to the matter, that if the President of the United States approves this bill after what he said in his

message to this Congress on the 8th day of April the President of the United States has turned just as complete a somersault as have the members of his party; but I have no doubt that, with his usually successful and compulsory seductiveness, he will have the entire majority, both in this branch and in the other, trailing submissively in his rear, and that they will be pleased upon this, as upon all other occasions, to give each other complete absolution and to pass bouquets and various flowers to each other until, finally, after the people have had one more chance to express their opinion upon this concoction of absurdities and inconsistencies, there will be placed a little wreath of lilies of the valley upon the corpse which will be interred three years from now. [Laughter.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I only wish to say, in reply to the Senator, that not only the President, in my judgment, approves this bill as a fair interpretation of his position and of the Democratic position, but I think when the Senator from Connecticut lays up to his soul the unctious that this bill is not satisfactory to the people of this country and that they will at some early day, as soon as they have an opportunity, express their disapproval and condemnation of it, the Senator is exceedingly blind to the actual situation in the country.

I am myself as thoroughly convinced that the people of this country are to-day more strongly behind this bill and that, taking them as a whole, it comes nearer giving general satisfaction to the people of this country than any other tariff bill that has ever been framed or presented to a Congress by any party since the foundation of the Government, with the exception of the Walker tariff bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Before it has taken effect.

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes; Senators on the other side of the Chamber said early in the beginning of this discussion that we were going to have a panic as the result of this bill. That was following upon the heels of the argument that has been made for nearly a quarter of a century that we had a panic in 1893 because of the anticipated passage of a Democratic tariff bill that did not become a law until a year after the panic began, and Senators have said that we were to have a repetition of that condition this year, and they have been waiting from day to day ever since this bill was introduced into the House of Representatives, with the solid backing of the Democratic membership of that body behind it, for business disturbance and then a panic. From day to day they have predicted that it would come, while every day the conditions in the country have grown better and better, until to-day, with only a few weeks before this tariff bill goes into effect, there is a condition of prosperity in this country that we have not witnessed in any time in recent years. There is not a cloud upon the horizon; there is not a responsible business man not interested in the tariff and trying to bring about some increase in duty who does not agree that the country, notwithstanding this bill is about to go into effect, is upon a sound and safe industrial, commercial, financial, and economic basis.

If we had a panic one year before the Wilson bill was passed in anticipation of it, then I want to ask Senators, if this bill is going to produce a panic, why has that panic been so long delayed, and how do they explain the fact we are now after months of discussion about to enter upon a new tariff system with no sign of panic, greatly to the disappointment and chagrin of some Senators on the other side of this Chamber?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator need not, because we are considering Schedule K, go "woolgathering" in any such manner as he has been doing in the last few moments. I never have said to the Senate or to anybody else that we were going to have a panic as the result of the passage of this bill.

Mr. McLEAN. I plead not guilty.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do think that the glowing conditions of prosperity which the Senator has so ably and truthfully pictured as having existed when the people made the mistake of putting him and his friends into power last November, and which, as the Senator has now borne testimony, exists right down to this minute—I think that that is the greatest tribute to the wisdom and the excellence of the laws under which the country has lived under the administration of the Republican Party.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the Senator let me add, and it is conclusive evidence that the people have no fear of this bill?

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, the Senator states that no panic has been produced, although this bill impends over the prosperity of the country like a cloud. The Senator and his friends have been saying for weeks that "the interests" were in a conspiracy to produce a panic for the purpose of discrediting this bill.

Of course it was absurd, as a great many of their statements are absurd, about the intention of the interests to pull down the temple about their own ears. Instead of trying to produce a panic, everybody is talking as cheerfully as he can for the purpose of warding off as much as possible of the baleful consequences that are bound to come upon the country. The people who have their notes in the bank to pay for their stocks of goods are trying to prevent any panic which would result in calling their loans. Everybody who is stocked up with goods is trying to whistle as he passes through the umbrageous shade of this impending horror, and to cheer himself up, so that at least he will gain time enough to work off upon the public a portion of the product which he has manufactured with the savings of his business before the floodgates and the bonded warehouses are opened and foreign goods made by cheap labor are dumped upon him in competition in the market where he has produced his goods at higher prices, better wages, and upon American standards of living.

I do not want any panic, and my party does not want any panic. We have not provided any panic at all. The country is prosperous to-day. I congratulate the Senate and the country upon the fact that we have the testimony of the chairman of the Committee on Finance embalmed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, so that if this bill, when put into operation, does not produce conditions which the country will say are an improvement upon existing conditions—which, from the Senator's statements, I should judge were about as good as we had a right to anticipate—the people of the country can then turn back to the words the Senator has to-day uttered and contrast their condition then with their condition now as testified to upon the highest Democratic authority and see how much they owe to the Democratic Party and whether it has justified the temporary lease of minority power which has been accidentally conferred upon it.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the picture just painted by the Senator from North Carolina of the wonderful prosperity that is to follow the enactment of this bill into law reminded me of what took place when the Wilson bill was under consideration. I wish to call his attention to the remarks made by Hon. William M. Springer in the House of Representatives when that bill was before that body. This was the prophecy then made:

Pass this bill and thousands of feet heretofore bare and thousands of limbs heretofore naked or covered with rags will be clothed in suitable garments; and the condition of all the people will be improved. It will give employment to 50,000 more operatives in woolen mills; it will increase the demand for wool, and prices will increase; and with increased demand for labor, wages will increase. Those who favor its passage may be assured that they have done something to promote the general weal, something—

To scatter plenty o'er a smiling land.

That is almost as pretty a picture as the Senator from North Carolina painted this morning as to what we may expect in the way of prosperity in this country upon the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut makes a very dire prophecy about the future of the Democratic Party. He proceeded to bury us in three years, I believe, and he was kind enough to put some lilies of the valley upon our graves.

The Senator having attended such a sad and disastrous political funeral last November, his mind naturally turns to graves and to flowers and to funerals. But I wish to say to the Senator that if the Democratic Party does suffer the misfortune of going to the graveyard of which he has spoken, we shall at least be buried in States larger than Vermont and Utah.

I take with a grain of salt all of this assault upon the Democratic Party about a failure to keep its promise to the people and about a betrayal of the people when it comes from one who was himself guilty, with his party, of the greatest betrayal known to the history of American politics; that of the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill; a betrayal so great that it destroyed his party and left it with two little States as the only evidences that it ever did exist.

Of course the Senator does not want any panic. Of course all these utterances made by the distinguished Senators who have just spoken and by other Senators upon that side, telling us of failures and of lockouts, are for the purpose only of helping the prosperity of the American people. But the Senator will find out that when this bill is passed the country will continue to enjoy even greater prosperity than it now enjoys and that the party to which he belongs can be buried in a State even smaller than Utah at the next presidential election. The Democratic Party is keeping the faith and fulfilling its platform promises

upon which we triumphed, and we shall appeal without fear and in full confidence to the American people upon our record here; and that appeal, in my judgment, will find triumphant vindication and approval at their hands.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Kentucky has exceeded even the iridescent dream read by the Senator from Utah as dreamed by the Hon. Mr. Springer on a previous occasion.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I simply rise to say that I do not know what started this filibuster, but I am not in sympathy with it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MARTINE of New Jersey in the chair). What is the pleasure of the Senate?

Mr. STONE. Let us proceed with the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the committee amendment in line 6, which has already been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read paragraph 301, on page 89, as follows:

301. Webbing, suspenders, braces, bandings, beltings, bindings, cords, cords and tassels, and ribbons; any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool or wool and India rubber are the component materials of chief value, 35 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 301, page 89, line 8, before the word "beltings," it is proposed to insert the word "belts"; also, in line 11, after the word "value," it is proposed to insert "and not specially provided for in this section," so as to make the paragraph read:

301. Webbing, suspenders, braces, bandings, belts, beltings, bindings, cords, cords and tassels, and ribbons; any of the foregoing made of wool or of which wool or wool and India rubber are the component materials of chief value, and not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 302, page 89, line 15, after the word "description," to insert "not specially provided for in this section," so as to make the paragraph read:

302. Aubusson, Axminster, moquette, and chenille carpets, figured or plain, and all carpets or carpeting of like character or description, not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read to the end of paragraph 309, on page 90.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to paragraph 309 in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out all of paragraph 309, as printed in the bill, and to insert:

309. Oriental, Berlin, Aubusson, Axminster, and similar rugs, and carpets of every description woven whole for rooms, the value of which exceeds 30 cents per square foot, 50 per cent ad valorem; when valued at 30 cents per square foot and under the same duty shall be assessed as that which applies to the same or similar grades of carpets, plus 5 per cent ad valorem.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator in brief what is the effect of the proposed amendment? Does it raise the duty or lower it?

Mr. STONE. It lowers it. The general effect is to lower the duty. To answer the Senator more specifically, it leaves the duty as it appears in the text of the bill.

Mr. WARREN. Does it raise the duty as to any of the grades included under it?

Mr. STONE. I was going to say that on whole-woven carpets valued at more than 30 cents per square foot the duty is left at 50 per cent ad valorem, just as in the printed paragraph. On like carpets valued at less than 30 cents per square foot the duty is reduced.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 311, page 90, line 13, after the word "wool," to strike out "flax," and in line 14, after the words "part of," to strike out "any" and insert "either," so as to make the paragraph read:

311. Carpets and carpeting of wool or cotton, or composed in part of either of them, not specially provided for in this section, and on mats, matting, and rugs of cotton, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 312, page 90, line 19, before the word "wholly," to strike out "made" and insert

"composed," and in the same line, after the word "in," to strike out "part" and insert "chief value," so as to make the paragraph read:

312. Mats, rugs for floors, screens, covers, hassocks, bed sides, art squares, and other portions of carpets or carpeting, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, and not specially provided for in this section, shall be subjected to the rate of duty herein imposed on carpets or carpeting of like character or description.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment was, on page 91, to strike out paragraph 314, in the following words:

314. Hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, and all hair on the skin of such animals, 20 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 315, page 91, line 7, after the word "animals," to strike out "25" and insert "5," so as to make the paragraph read:

315. Tops made from the hair of the Angora-goat, alpaca, and other like animals, 5 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 316, page 91, line 9, after the word "animals," to strike out "30" and insert "15," so as to make the paragraph read:

316. Yarns made of the hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, 15 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 317, page 91, line 12, before the words "per cent," to strike out "40" and insert "35," so as to make the paragraph read:

317. Cloth and all manufactures of every description made of the hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, and other like animals, not specially provided for in this section, 35 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS. On behalf of the committee I offer an amendment to paragraph 317, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 91, line 10, after the word "made," it is proposed to insert "by any process, wholly or in chief value."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 318, page 91, line 16, after the word "surface," to insert "and woven figured upholstery goods"; in line 17, before the words "of the," to strike out "partly" and insert "in chief value of wool or"; in line 18, after the word "alpaca," to strike out "and" and insert "or"; and in line 19, after the word "velvets," to strike out "50" and insert "40," so as to make the paragraph read:

318. Plushes, velvets, and all other pile fabrics, cut or uncut, woven or knit, whether or not the pile covers the entire surface, and woven figured upholstery goods, made wholly or in chief value of wool or of the hair of the Angora goat, alpaca, or other like animals, and articles made wholly or in chief value of such plushes or velvets, 40 per cent ad valorem.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 91, after line 20, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

318½. The provisions of this schedule (K) shall be effective on and after the 1st day of January, 1914.

Mr. SMOOT. I have heard it stated, of course not on the floor of the Senate, that the committee have that paragraph under consideration and that there is some likelihood it will be changed so as to have the rate take effect upon wool on a certain day and another date for woolen goods. I should like to ask the Senator from Missouri if there is any suggestion of that kind under consideration?

Mr. STONE. I think it would be very well to have the paragraph adopted as it is and let that matter go into conference.

Mr. SMOOT. The suggestion is a proper one, and I have no objection to it, but I simply call the attention of the Senator to this. If it went to conference, could there be a date upon woolen goods later than the 1st day of January, 1914, because the latest provision in the Senate committee amendment is the 1st day of January, 1914?

Mr. STONE. It is an entirely new paragraph inserted by the Senate committee, and I should think that the conferees could make any change they desired.

Mr. SMOOT. I think they can change it anywhere between the date of the passage of the act and the 1st day of January, 1914, but I do not believe they could under the rules extend it beyond that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I ask that we go back to the first two paragraphs of this schedule if the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] is prepared to take them up.

Mr. SMOOT. Before that is done I wish to make a short statement.

I have proposed a substitute for this schedule, and I expected to-day to take it up for consideration and to be voted upon; I also expected to take an hour or so to explain its provisions. But I am not feeling very well to-day. I have a severe headache, and for that reason and that only I shall withhold offering it to-day; but I will offer it when the bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. STONE. Does the Senator not think it preferable to offer it in the Senate?

Mr. SMOOT. It would not be preferable to me, but I shall offer it in the Senate, as I said.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I introduced yesterday an amendment in the nature of a substitute to this schedule which I propose to offer. I have prepared still another, but as both of them start with raw wool at a less rate of duty than that proposed by the Senator from Utah in the substitute which he will offer, and as I think they should follow his rather than precede it, I shall reserve offering them, and some observations which I propose to submit with them in explanation of their provisions, until we have reached this schedule in the Senate and until after the Senator from Utah has proposed his substitute.

Mr. STONE. Now, Mr. President, I will ask the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] if he is ready to proceed?

WOOL TOPS.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I seek recognition now at the suggestion of the Senator at present in charge of the schedule, and I shall take only a few minutes. I wish to address myself to the matter of tops, and, of course, yarns follow. I do this entirely in the interest of the woolgrower, the manufacturer not considered. In view of the fact that wool is the only industry in this bill, highly protected now and heretofore, which is proposed to be absolutely torn down and made free, and that almost immediately, I think we should be entitled to at least some patience in presenting our case and to careful and prayerful consideration thereof, either here on the floor now or by the committee before final passage of the bill.

The woolgrowers feel that the knife has been plunged to its very hilt into their hearts, and they do not like to have the knife turned in the wound and the corpus delicti mutilated. This matter of only a 5 per cent ad valorem duty on tops does exactly that.

Many years ago I had my attention called to this matter of tops through differences which arose between an editor of a wool and cotton periodical and one of the former presidents of the Wool Manufacturers' Association. The matter called out a good deal of personal feeling and differences, and my sympathies were all against any large duty upon tops. I investigated it with an idea to greatly reduce the duty on tops. So I was not animated by any desire to have a high duty upon that product.

The investigation showed me most plainly, as it has nearly or quite everyone who has worked it out carefully, that if we pass this bill with 5 per cent only on tops the imports to this country will not be in raw wool but will be in tops, because nearly all the cloths are made from yarn, and yarn is made from tops, so that the large proportion of the wool must first be made into tops.

I understand that the Senate committee in considering this subject has expected to provide that the American woolgrower may be put upon an equality with the foreign woolgrower so that he may be in the world's market. It is impossible, however, to do this if you admit wool free, because of a difference in transportation. That is something I can not perhaps ask the committee to consider and remedy at this time with the views its members have, but in the matter of tops, this proposed differentiation will oblige us in this country to sell the domestic wool as much lower than the foreign wool as the difference is in making up the tops; that is to say, if they are made for 3 to 6 cents a pound less in a foreign country than here, our wool has to go low enough to make up that difference, and added to that we lose the benefit in American labor of so many men as would be engaged in making those tops. In other words, American-grown wool would be shipped to England, made into tops, and returned here, or its equivalent in cost, in order to establish a parity between the domestic and foreign wool.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator remembers the statement as to the difference in the cost of tops made by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] yesterday.

Mr. WARREN. I think in his estimate the cost of tops ran from 13 cents in one calculation and grade to as low as 6 cents in the other, made in this country. I have not looked over his remarks.

Mr. HUGHES. My recollection is that the report of the Tariff Board makes the cost of producing woolen tops very low in this country.

Mr. WARREN. The Tariff Board report is such that it takes a combination of different parts of the report, because they report on the scouring of wool as separate from the combing, and so forth. But I have examined the report of the Tariff Board very closely, and one can deduce at once from it that the difference is against us.

Mr. HUGHES. What does the Senator say is the cost of making tops abroad?

Mr. WARREN. The cost of making tops runs from 3 cents and something to 7 cents over there, on different calculations and grades, and the cost here runs from about 6 cents to 13 cents.

Mr. HUGHES. In no case would there be a difference of 10 cents.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, no. If the Senator thought I said that there was a difference of 10 cents per pound, there was a misunderstanding. I did not mean that, nor did I intend to say it.

Mr. HUGHES. That is what I understood the Senator to say.

Mr. WARREN. Paragraph 295 of the bill as it passed the House provided that "combed wool or tops, and roving or roping made wholly or in part of wool or camel's hair, and on other wool and hair which have been advanced in any manner or by any process of manufacture beyond the washed or scoured condition, not specially provided for in this section, 15 per cent ad valorem."

The Senate Finance Committee amended this paragraph to make the rate 5 per cent ad valorem.

The rate of duty carried in the Payne-Aldrich Act of 1909 was 24½ cents per pound plus 30 per cent, on combed wool or "tops" valued at not more than 20 cents per pound, or 36½ cents per pound plus 30 per cent if valued at more than 20 cents per pound.

Freights from foreign countries to our wool markets, from which the factories purchase their supplies, range from 17 cents to \$1.05 per 100 pounds, while the average rate of the western woolgrower, in localities where most of the wool is grown, is at least an average of \$1.75, running, as it does, from \$1.32 to \$1.98 per 100 pounds railroad freight.

Now, it takes about 3 pounds of grease wool from our ranges to make 1 pound of scoured wool. Therefore the difference is three times that amount on scoured wool, or 2½ to 5 cents per pound.

The Tariff Board, which made a thorough investigation of the cost of turning wool into tops in this country and England, found that 80 per cent is the approximate excess of the American cost over the English.

The tariff rate on tops under the Dingley and Payne Acts practically has excluded tops from importation into this country, thus protecting the market for our domestic wool production and creating a field for the investment of capital in mills, and, in addition, and far more important, providing employment for a large number of American workmen engaged in converting unwashed grease wool into a fully cleansed and condensed product of manufacture ready for the spinner.

I have procured two different calculations of the cost of making tops from grease wool in England and the United States. One was made by manufacturers, and as manufacturers, excepting those who themselves make tops, would benefit by buying tops in a foreign market instead of wool if the labor in the foreign country could be performed for less than in America, I assume their figures would be lower instead of higher than the average in computing the difference in cost. The other set of figures was made for me by a prominent wool dealer, who buys both domestic and foreign wool, and who would prefer to see manufacturers buy, first, home-grown wool, or, second, foreign unmanufactured wool, rather than to see the foreign country perform all the labor and get the benefit of making tops. This dealer's figures make the difference in cost between foreign and domestic tops nearly twice as much as the first mentioned.

And so I have had careful computations made as to what result would obtain from a 5 per cent and a 10 per cent and also a 15 per cent ad valorem rate.

On a 5 per cent duty basis England would have the advantage of us by at least 3 cents a pound. At 10 per cent England would still have the advantage. But on a 15 per cent basis there would be ample difference to protect the American grower. It is quite possible that 12½ per cent might, on an average, cover the ground.

In this connection I would ask to have inserted in the RECORD in connection with my remarks a communication to the chair-

man of the Senate Finance Committee, signed by over 100 responsible firms and individuals engaged in the wool business in Boston.

The communication referred to is as follows:

Hon. F. McL. SIMMONS,

Chairman Senate Committee on Finance, Washington, D. C.

Boston, July 24, 1913.

DEAR SIR: Referring to H. R. 3321, Schedule K, paragraphs 295 and 296, we, the undersigned, engaged in the wool business in Boston, desire to call to your attention that it is our honest practical opinion that the proposed duty of 5 per cent on tops and roving and 15 per cent on yarns, if it becomes effective, will result in very large importations of these partially manufactured products of wool and a relatively much lessened importation of raw wool.

It necessarily follows that wool of domestic growth will sell on a lower basis to meet this competition than it would bring if the competition was more largely with foreign wool in the raw state.

Respectfully, yours,

Brown & Adams; Halliwell, Jones & Donald; Farnsworth, Thayer & Stephenson; Cordingley, Barrett & Co.; Manger & Avery; Ayres, Bridges & Co.; Goodhue, Studley & Emery; Adams & Hollingdrake; Robert C. Sears & Co.; Dupree & Meadows; Jacob H. Wood & Co.; A. H. Clifford & Son; Jeremiah Williams & Co.; Dewey, Gould & Co.; Hecht, Liebmann & Co.; Luce & Manning; Anthony & Waters; William H. Harris; Hobbs, Taft & Co.; Francis Willey & Co.; Alex. Livingstone; Sulzberger & Sons Co.; O. N. Purdy, Jr.; J. W. Foster & Co.; J. Koshland & Co.; Crimmins & Peirce; Elsemann Bros.; Salter Bros. & Co.; George Harrington; Edwin Wilcock; Henry T. Brown; Roope Eddy Co.; T. A. Kennedy & Co.; Frank R. Peters; Swift Wool Co.; Fred M. Blanchard; George S. Wood & Co.; J. P. Boutwell; E. B. Carleton & Co.; Houghton Wool Co.; F. A. Wyman; Louis B. Harding; S. C. Murfit; George W. Benedict; E. Nathaniel Perkins; Johnson, Sheridan & Co.; Henry & Co.; Henderson & Co.; H. T. Dobson & Co.; G. E. Blaisdell; Caverly & Co.; Standt & Co.; Hartley & Co.; Edwin F. Leeds; Worcester & Co.; Hills & Nichols; W. R. Bateman; Baker Bros. & Co.; Walker Wool Co.; F. R. Shattuck, Jr.; John Ross; Richard Webster; C. F. Rich & Co.; P. Mc Graw Wool Co.; O. N. Purdy & Co.; Sutcliffe & Co.; Patterson & Co.; F. N. Graves & Co.; Carl Grubnau & Son; John L. Farrell; Walsh & Co. (Inc.); Lothrop & Bennett; Daniel S. Pratt & Co.; Eugene Ireland & Co.; Henry A. Ruth; F. A. Varney; Levi P. Bowers & A. L. Wood & Co.; Charles F. Cross & Co.; Schmidt Corporation; Richard Olney, 2d; Winslow & Co.; John G. Wright & Co. (Inc.); F. M. Macomber; J. J. Collins; H. M. Payne & Co.; Follett & Co.; Fred W. Boyd; A. Polhemus; B. Howard Coffin; Williams & Smith; H. R. Williams; C. B. Harkness; Wright Bros.; Alfred Akeroyd; H. & F. P. Simonds; William E. Wall; W. A. Blanchard; The Forino Co.; Rosenthal Bros.; Agnew & Co.; J. Whittingham & Sons; George W. Whitaker & Co.; A. F. Baker & Co.

Mr. WARREN. It would be impossible to say just what percentage of the number of persons employed in mills which manufacture tops solely or as a part of their business would be deprived of their avocation should the industry be annihilated here and transferred to England, Germany, and France. Those familiar with the business believe that upward of 10 per cent, or 16,000 persons out of the more than 160,000 employed in our mills, would be deprived of work if protection equal to the difference in cost of production at home and abroad should be denied.

The loss to the woolgrower would be direct and disastrous, for the market for the greater part of the domestic clip would suffer this difference. Our wool would substantially fall below the world's price because of this handicap. This we can provide against in the pending bill by accepting the House figures rather than those of the Senate committee. Another handicap—that of transportation—we can not so easily remedy, and because of this we certainly ought to remedy this "tops" grievance as we go along.

Of course, I understand that with the discipline and perfect party organization with which the honorable chairman and the committee in charge of this bill are backed, it is perfectly useless for me to offer an amendment. I do not propose to offer an amendment. I know very well that none would be accepted unless they should take it over and offer it from the other side as one of their own, and I must say that I admire such organization.

If I have noticed the doings of the Senate accurately, there has not yet been a single roll call in which the solid Democratic Party, with the exception that has been officially made for two Senators, have not followed their leaders and have not carried the point at issue. So I shall move no amendment now, but I want to plead for the woolgrower that, after you have taken away his protection, you leave him on a basis at least equal, or as nearly equal as may be, in raw-wool value to that of other countries.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to get the Senator's idea in reference to this matter. I realize, of course, as everyone must, that this is a radical reduction. I recollect that the figures in the hand-

book show that the duty is somewhere around 100 per cent, and we have reduced it to 5 per cent.

Mr. WARREN. This being Saturday and a half holiday, we ought to have a desire to finish this schedule to-day, and I do not care to go into a technical discussion.

Mr. HUGHES. I do not want the Senator to do that, but I simply wanted to get his point of view with reference to the suggestion he made a minute or two ago, for my own information.

Wool in the raw state is vastly different of course from tops, and we would be greatly handicapped from the standpoint of transporting large numbers of tops. Do I understand the Senator's idea is that with a low duty on tops it would tend to bring imported wool into this country in the shape of tops?

Mr. WARREN. Entirely.

Mr. HUGHES. That is something which ought to be considered, but is it not true that the difficulties the Senator anticipates in the way of bringing in wool in the grease would not be obviated by bringing it in scoured; that is preliminary of course to turning it into tops?

Mr. WARREN. I thank the Senator for that suggestion. That is exactly what the woolgrowers are now considering and have been considering, for that matter, in the West, whether it would be possible to do the scouring in a way that might make the product acceptable to the manufacturer and cheaply enough to cover costs of plants for that purpose, and so forth.

Mr. HUGHES. I catch the Senator's idea. He is speaking, then, not of the transportation of home-grown wool but of foreign wool.

Mr. WARREN. I am speaking of how much more it will cost us to get our home-grown wool to the market than it costs to get the foreign wool to our market. In other words, our market, where our manufacturers buy, is such that it costs more to lay down at the factory our home-grown wool from where the largest quantity is supplied than it costs to get it from a foreign country.

I can not expect the committee at this stage of the bill to remedy that. What I do ask is that, having to suffer, as we must, this transportation disadvantage, and having to accept free trade as against the advantages of the other side, we may not have to endure this further disadvantage and loss which a 5 per cent duty only on tops would inflict upon the American woolgrowers.

The first difficulty they will try to struggle through with by themselves, but as for this second one, 5 per cent tops, it would seem mischievous and trifling to insist upon the Senate cut. Probably what made the trouble, as has been suggested, is that tops were formerly put away up into the sky as to their tariff rate. If I can go back a little and take a moment, I will explain how that originally happened.

Years ago there was a constant friction between woolgrowers and manufacturers. The Woolgrowers' Association had as its president Judge Lawrence, of Ohio, formerly a Member of Congress and formerly, I believe, Comptroller of the Treasury or an assistant. He was for a high tariff, watching closely, of course, the holes in the wall where foreigners were taking advantage of us. In the first Cleveland administration, through a ruling of the Treasury Department, broken tops were allowed to come in with the lowest rate of wastes. The consequence was that the best tops could be mutilated a little and sent in almost at free-trade rates. That, of course, being taken up later on by Judge Lawrence and his association, he undertook to obtain a rate so high that no tops could be brought in under any circumstances at a profit, on the ground that he wanted, first, to prevent fraud; second, to protect the woolgrower in his products; and, third, to insure the labor of making tops in this country.

For instance, the rate under the Payne-Aldrich Act was 24½ cents per pound plus 30 per cent on combed wool or tops valued at more than 30 cents per pound, and 36½ cents a pound plus 30 per cent if valued at more than 20 cents per pound. That was entirely above any necessity of protection so far as the real comparison between raw wool and the other was concerned.

But that went into the Dingley bill. Judge Lawrence, whom I followed as president of that association, became so angry because I was, as he termed me, a low-tariff man in considering the Dingley bill, that he never spoke to me afterwards.

Mr. THOMAS. Who was that, may I inquire?

Mr. WARREN. Judge Lawrence. Now, looking at it from any standpoint—and I have here before me, in fact—

Mr. STONE. Did the Senator change his position from a low-tariff man after he and Judge Lawrence—

Mr. WARREN. I am still a low-tariff man. I am a low-tariff man, but not a no-tariff man.

Let me say to the committee, if I had my way I would put a revenue tariff on every article of import that comes into this

country, not so much, perhaps, for the amount of revenue as to keep the book account straight. Make it nominal, if you please, in many or most cases, but have everything that comes into this country listed and make it bring some revenue—enough, at least, to carry on the expense of assessing and collecting it. I think it would harm no one. It would be so trifling that the foreigner would be glad to pay it, as a sort of license; and it would give us the information we want as to the quality, quantity, prices, and so forth, of imports.

I have here a communication, a part of which I may insert in my remarks, from Samuel S. Dale, who is well known as one who opposed bitterly the Payne tariff bill; who has been opposed to high tariffs on wool; who has been for a very low tariff. He closes as follows:

The Finance Committee's schedule discriminates against the wool-grower, whose product is free, and against the worsted drawing and spinning industries, whose products, roving and yarn, are subject to rates proportionately lower than the rate on finished cloth. These inequalities should be corrected in order that, so far as is possible, all producers may be equal under the tariff law and the country may be spared from further agitation over Schedule K.

SAM'L. S. DALE, Boston, Mass.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wyoming yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WARREN. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. I was attracted by the observation of the Senator that if he had his way in constructing a tariff bill he would put an import duty on everything that comes into the country. It seems to me if that were done, including tea and coffee and those articles, it would produce a very large revenue, however low the duty might be, and the great industries of the country would have no chance whatever.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps the Senator did not give due weight to my observation. While I would make them nominal as to a great many things, sufficient only to carry the expense of noting and printing the information for bookkeeping, and so forth, I do not think the Senator and I would differ as to the change and rise of rates necessary from the nominal to the protective in every article, because I desire to plead guilty now, as of old, to being a protectionist, although in this case the protection that I am asking for in this matter of tops is merely to take off one of the inequalities so that the bill may make good what it has proposed to do; that is, give us the world's market at least for our wool product in this country.

As nearly as we can figure it, out of the 160,000 men employed in making cloth, the making of tops in this country would employ 10 per cent, or 16,000 people.

That is an item to be considered after you have considered the woolgrower. Do you want to cut out that many laborers from doing that work in this country and allow it to be done in another country because the labor there is less than here and because your too low tariff permits them to do all of this labor?

As I have said before, all I can do is to appeal. I should be glad if this committee on its own volition would offer either to strike out their amendment or to name a slightly lower figure than that of the House; but if they are not disposed to do it, if they are not willing to do it, if they feel that even an observation from this side would injure their organization in some way, then I want to appeal in the most earnest manner in which it is possible for a man to appeal, that when they go to conference they may do there as we have had to do a great many times, as the honorable chairman of this committee knows. I have had some experience with conferences where we compose our differences and I have, as probably the chairman and other Senators have, sometimes been rather liberal in cuts downward or in rises upward in committee, so that I might have the backing of the Senate to a difference with the House large enough, so that if we found stubborn resistance we could compose our differences somewhere between the higher and the lower figure.

Now, if it should be that out of conference there should come a bill with a 5 per cent duty only, you will have done what I said in opening, not only plunged in the knife, but turned the blade and lacerated the victim after accomplishing the destruction.

If it should go as low as 10 per cent there will be quite large imports. If you go lower than 12½ per cent, you are going to work extreme hardship upon the woolgrower. I hope you will recede from that amendment and allow the House figure to stand as to tops.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. Did the Senator wish to interrupt me?

Mr. JAMES. I thought the Senator was through.

Mr. WARREN. While I am on the floor, as we are at the end now of the wool schedule, I want to speak of one other matter.

I have been waiting to see if the honorable senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] would come in, because one of the points of his able speech the other day on the free-wool side of the question was that we were the only country in the world except darkest Russia that had any tariff on wool. I may be mistaken, but I have hunted through all the authorities, and I find that Mexico has a tariff on raw wool, Cuba has a tariff on raw wool, Canada has a tariff on certain grades of wool and certain prices, and so on.

I submit herewith a list which I wish to include in my remarks:

COUNTRIES WITH WOOL TARIFFS.

Mexico: Raw wool, about 11 cents per pound.
Cuba: Raw wool from United States, 20 per cent; other countries, 40 per cent.

Canada: Wool, Leicester, Cotswold, Lincolnshire, Southdown, combing wools, or wools known as luster wools and other like combing wools, such as grown in Canada, 3 cents per pound; worsted tops, 15 per cent; yarns, 30 per cent. (Canadian customs tariff, Apr. 12, 1907.)

Australia: Wool yarns, 10 per cent.

Venezuela: Wool, 7 cents per pound.

Haiti: Wool, 4 cents per pound.

Germany: Combed wool, 47 cents per pound.

France: Combed wool, 32.50 francs per pound.

Italy: Combed wool, 15 lire per pound.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does not the Senator think—I am merely asking him for his opinion—that all the countries that he has named, with the possible exception of Canada, in imposing these duties do it merely for revenue purposes?

Mr. WARREN. I am not raising that question now, because the honorable Senator who makes the inquiry and I are diametrically opposed in theory, for, of course, I would make a revenue bill with protection considered, and he would make a revenue bill with protection not considered. However, in speaking of free wool and the condition that we are in in competition with other countries, and so forth, I felt it proper to correct what I thought was a misstatement about wool.

There are France, Italy, and other countries that regulate the rates of duty on wool on the basis of whether it is raw or manufactured or partly manufactured.

Mr. JAMES. But France has unwashed, washed, and scoured wool free, has it not?

Mr. WARREN. What is the Senator's question?

Mr. JAMES. Has not France unwashed, washed, and scoured wool free?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; France has raw wool free.

Mr. CATRON. Mr. President, I simply wish to state that a few days ago I introduced an amendment to this bill intended as a substitute for Schedule K. I do not desire to call it up now, but I give notice that I shall present it when the bill reaches the Senate, and shall insist on a vote upon it, unless some of the other amendments which would suit me better which have been offered to the schedule shall be adopted.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I desire to place in the Record, without reading it, a table showing the population of the various States and the total production, importation, and consumption of wool by States, according to the Thirteenth Census of the United States, in 1910.

I also desire to file another paper, without reading it, showing the number of farms in each State, the number of sheep in each State, and the number of sheep on each farm in each of the various States.

I also desire to state that the census of 1910 shows that there were 6,351,502 farms in the United States, and that only upon 598,047 farms were there reported sheep, according to the census, which shows that the tariff, which we are told is placed upon wool for the benefit of the farmer, taxes 10 farmers who do not raise sheep for the benefit of 1 who does.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the tables referred to by the Senator from Kentucky will be printed in the Record.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Population of the United States, by States; total production, importation, and consumption of wool by States, according to the Thirteenth Census of the United States, 1910.

[590,996,078 pounds wool consumed in 1909, or 6.4 pounds per capita.]

States.	Population.	Wool produced.	Wool consumed.
		Pounds.	Pounds.
New England:			
Maine.....	742,371	1,200,000	4,751,174
New Hampshire.....	430,572	420,000	2,755,660
Vermont.....	355,956	1,170,000	2,278,113
Massachusetts.....	3,366,416	217,000	21,545,062
Rhode Island.....	542,610	39,750	3,472,704
Connecticut.....	1,114,756	183,750	7,134,438
Middle Atlantic:			
New York.....	9,113,614	4,950,000	58,327,130
New Jersey.....	2,537,167	275,000	16,237,869
Pennsylvania.....	7,665,111	6,300,000	49,056,710

Population of the United States, by States; total production, importation, and consumption of wool by States, etc.—Continued.

States.	Population.	Wool produced.	Wool consumed.
		Pounds.	Pounds.
East North Central:			
Ohio.....	4,767,121	16,900,000	30,509,574
Indiana.....	2,700,876	5,850,000	17,285,006
Illinois.....	5,638,591	4,960,000	36,068,982
Michigan.....	2,810,175	11,475,000	17,985,097
Wisconsin.....	2,333,800	6,075,000	14,936,704
West North Central:			
Minnesota.....	2,075,708	2,550,000	13,284,531
Iowa.....	2,224,771	5,400,000	14,235,534
Missouri.....	3,293,335	6,020,000	21,077,344
North Dakota.....	577,056	1,755,000	3,683,163
South Dakota.....	583,888	4,082,500	3,736,839
Nebraska.....	1,192,214	1,625,000	7,650,170
Kansas.....	1,690,949	1,312,000	10,321,074
South Atlantic:			
Delaware.....	202,322	38,500	1,294,861
Maryland.....	1,265,246	676,000	8,290,214
District of Columbia.....	331,069		2,118,842
Virginia.....	2,061,612	1,642,500	13,194,317
West Virginia.....	1,221,119	3,450,000	7,815,162
North Carolina.....	2,206,287	765,000	14,130,237
South Carolina.....	1,615,400	187,500	9,096,560
Georgia.....	2,609,121	675,000	16,698,374
Florida.....	752,619	373,000	4,816,762
East South Central:			
Kentucky.....	2,289,905	3,800,000	14,655,392
Tennessee.....	2,184,789	1,238,000	13,972,650
Alabama.....	2,138,093	590,000	13,683,795
Mississippi.....	1,797,114	600,000	11,501,530
West South Central:			
Arkansas.....	1,574,449	800,000	10,076,474
Louisiana.....	1,656,388	573,500	10,300,883
Oklahoma.....	1,657,155	520,000	10,605,792
Texas.....	3,899,642	8,943,750	24,937,869
Mountain:			
Montana.....	376,053	33,600,000	2,406,729
Idaho.....	325,594	15,980,000	2,083,702
Wyoming.....	145,965	36,037,500	924,176
Colorado.....	799,024	9,100,000	5,114,754
New Mexico.....	327,301	19,200,000	2,094,726
Arizona.....	204,354	4,950,000	1,307,866
Utah.....	373,351	14,175,000	2,389,446
Nevada.....	81,875	5,950,000	523,960
Pacific:			
Washington.....	1,141,090	4,050,000	7,308,736
Oregon.....	672,765	14,437,500	4,305,096
California.....	2,377,549	13,300,000	15,216,314
Total.....	91,972,266	281,362,750	590,996,078
Pulled wool.....		40,000,000	
Grand total.....		321,362,750	

The wool production is taken from the Agricultural Yearbook for 1910, and the item "Pulled wool, 40,000,000," being wool pulled from sheepskins, is not distributed to States.

This item is about one-seventh of all the wool produced, and if distributed equally among the States will increase the production figures of each State by one-seventh—an amount not appreciable in the general comparison with the consumption of each State.

Number of farms in United States, census of 1910.

State.	Number of farms.	Number of sheep.	Average number of sheep on each farm.
Maine.....	60,016	206,434	3 ¹ / ₂
New Hampshire.....	27,053	43,772	1 ¹ / ₂
Vermont.....	32,709	118,551	4
Massachusetts.....	36,917	82,708	(¹ / ₂)
Rhode Island.....	5,232	6,789	1 ¹ / ₂
Connecticut.....	26,815	22,418	1 ¹ / ₂
New England.....	188,802	430,672	2 ¹ / ₂
New York.....	215,597	930,300	4 ¹ / ₂
New Jersey.....	33,487	80,683	(¹ / ₂)
Pennsylvania.....	219,295	883,074	4
Middle Atlantic.....	468,379	1,844,057	(¹ / ₂)
Ohio.....	272,045	3,909,162	14 ¹ / ₂
Indiana.....	215,485	1,336,967	6
Illinois.....	251,872	1,050,846	4
Michigan.....	206,960	2,306,476	11 ¹ / ₂
Wisconsin.....	177,127	929,783	5 ¹ / ₂
East North Central.....	1,123,489	9,542,234	8 ¹ / ₂
Minnesota.....	156,137	637,582	4
Iowa.....	217,044	1,145,549	5 ¹ / ₂
Missouri.....	277,244	1,811,288	6 ¹ / ₂
North Dakota.....	74,360	293,371	4
South Dakota.....	77,644	611,264	8
Nebraska.....	129,678	293,500	2 ¹ / ₂
Kansas.....	177,841	272,475	1 ¹ / ₂
West North Central.....	1,109,948	5,065,009	4 ¹ / ₂

¹ Less than 1.

² Average per farm.

³ Less than 4.

Number of farms in United States, census of 1910—Continued.

State.	Number of farms.	Number of sheep.	Average number of sheep on each farm.
Delaware.....	10,836	7,806	1 ¹ / ₂
Maryland.....	48,923	237,137	5
District of Columbia.....	217		
Virginia.....	184,018	804,873	4 ¹ / ₂
West Virginia.....	96,635	910,360	9 ¹ / ₂
North Carolina.....	253,725	214,473	(¹ / ₂)
South Carolina.....	176,434	37,559	(¹ / ₂)
Georgia.....	291,027	187,644	(¹ / ₂)
Florida.....	50,016	113,701	2 ¹ / ₂
South Atlantic.....	1,111,881	2,513,553	2 ¹ / ₂
Kentucky.....	259,185	1,363,013	5 ¹ / ₂
Tennessee.....	246,012	795,033	3 ¹ / ₂
Alabama.....	262,901	142,930	(¹ / ₂)
Mississippi.....	274,352	185,245	2
East South Central.....	1,042,480	2,496,221	2 ¹ / ₂
Arkansas.....	214,678	144,189	1 ¹ / ₂
Louisiana.....	120,546	178,287	1 ¹ / ₂
Oklahoma.....	190,192	62,472	1 ¹ / ₂
Texas.....	417,770	1,808,709	4 ¹ / ₂
West South Central.....	943,186	2,193,657	2 ¹ / ₂
Montana.....	26,214	5,380,746	207
Idaho.....	30,807	3,019,478	97
Wyoming.....	10,987	5,397,161	490
Colorado.....	46,170	1,430,214	31
New Mexico.....	25,676	3,346,984	128
Arizona.....	9,227	1,239,733	136
Utah.....	21,676	1,827,180	87
Nevada.....	2,689	1,154,795	444
Mountain.....	153,446	22,770,201	124
Washington.....	56,192	475,555	8 ¹ / ₂
Oregon.....	45,502	2,680,135	60
California.....	88,197	2,417,477	27 ¹ / ₂
Pacific.....	159,891	5,592,167	30
United States.....	6,361,502	52,447,861	8 ¹ / ₂

¹ Less than 1.

² Less than 1.

³ Less than 1.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I started last evening to prepare a statement similar to that presented by the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] as to rice, showing the number of farms producing rice, the amount produced, and the number of States which produced it, following exactly the same line as has the Senator from Kentucky with wool; but I was called away from that work about 10 o'clock and could not return to it. This morning I was called to the depot at 7.30 o'clock and was unable to prepare the statement. I will, however, prepare it at some time in the future.

Mr. JAMES. I will suggest, Mr. President, that I very much hope the Senator will prepare that table. The reason I prepared these particular tables was that I wanted to make it easy for the various Senators who voted for a tax upon wool to explain to the people just how many pounds of wool, in addition to what they produced in a particular State, they had to have imported there in order to supply the consumption; so that they could explain, without any difficulty of research, just how much the burden was upon the consumers of each State, and where it was not a burden how much the benefit was. It was merely in order to make easy those explanations to the public that I have furnished these tables. As an example, in my own State of Kentucky we produced in 1910, as shown by the census, 3,800,000 pounds of wool, and our 2,289,905 population consumed 14,655,392 pounds of wool. In other words, we had to import into the State 10,855,392 pounds of wool more than we produced to supply our people, upon which the tariff tax had to be paid.

Mr. SMOOT. And the object I had, Mr. President, in preparing the other table was that I wanted to make it very easy for the Senator from Kentucky and others who voted for a duty upon rice to show that its burden rested upon nearly nine-tenths of the States and of the people of those States who do not produce a pound of rice.

Mr. JAMES. I hope the Senator from Utah, in making that table about rice, will not take the position that rice is as essential to the living of our people as is clothing.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there are more pounds of rice consumed in this country to-day than there are pounds of wool used.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I desire to recur to the paragraph of this schedule under consideration, the paragraph in relation to tops, and to say in that connection that I am unable

to agree with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] that the woolgrower is to any extent whatever interested in the restoration of the 15 per cent duty upon this product which the House bill carries. I desire to introduce what I have to say upon this subject by asking that there be read from the desk an editorial which appeared in the Boston Journal of May 19, 1913. I ask for its reading the more readily, Mr. President, because of its containing some criticism of the Democratic attitude and the Democratic procedure in relation to this measure. It will be discerned from it that it comes from no friendly source.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield just a moment before he enters upon the discussion—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I see the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has escaped. I desired to make an interrogatory of him before he left. I believe the Senator from Kentucky has friends present, so I will make the interrogatory, and he may answer when he returns. He has very kindly placed in the RECORD—so he said—a statement of the number of States that produce sheep and the number of sheep in the States, showing from his point of view the number of people that are taxed for the benefit of the sheep growers. I wanted to ask him to place in the RECORD also the number of manufacturers of cloth and ready-made clothing in the United States, and also a statement of the number of people who wear clothes, in order to show the number of people that he is proposing to tax for the benefit of those manufacturers of ready-made clothing. This bill places a duty of 35 per cent on ready-made clothing and, according to the theory of the Senator from Kentucky, those duties are for the purpose of protecting the manufacturers of ready-made clothes.

Mr. WILLIAMS and Mr. WARREN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Kansas yield?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator from Mississippi, through the courtesy of the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. I have the floor, Mr. President.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Montana has the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair realizes that the floor belongs to the Senator from Montana, but he yielded the floor to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. WALSH. I had expected—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask the Senator from Montana to yield to me for one or two pertinent or impertinent observations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WALSH. I desire to be accommodating upon this matter, but I suggest to the Senators that I have the floor and have something to say.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH. I regret that this general discussion should be injected into the midst of my remarks. If any Senator simply desires to ask a question, I shall be very glad to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wanted to suggest that perhaps the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] had inadvertently overspoken himself. He said something about our levying a tax for the benefit of the manufacturers of ready-made clothing. Of course the Senator from Kansas knows that that is not true. He knows that we propose to reduce the taxes which the Republican Party have levied upon the people.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. BRISTOW. I shall not pursue the discussion any further, because I recognize that the Senator from Montana wants to complete his remarks, and I will take the matter up later.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield to me for a second?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. I want to address myself for a moment to the Senator from Kansas [Mr. BRISTOW] and to say that yesterday, when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] proposed to insert in the RECORD certain papers and figures which, I

judge from what he says, have now been inserted, I asked him to advise me so that I might record with them some figures similar to those proposed just now by the Senator from Kansas. I think the Senator from Kentucky probably did not hear me. I hope the Senator from Kansas will take occasion to put such figures into the RECORD. I should be obliged to him if he would do that later on.

Mr. BRISTOW. Well, Mr. President, if the Senator from Montana will yield just a moment—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield further?

Mr. WALSH. I yield.

Mr. BRISTOW. I will say that I do not intend to put any such figures in the RECORD. I do not think there is anything in such figures—there is no argument in them. They are simply ridiculous fulminations that are based upon an entirely erroneous theory in regard to tariff taxation.

Mr. WARREN. That is true; but inasmuch as one side has been presented it is well enough to look at both sides of the picture and compare them.

Mr. BRISTOW. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. Now, I ask that the Secretary read the editorial which I have sent to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

HOW ABOUT WOOL TOPS?

There is a product of wool manufacture called "wool tops." How it gained the name of "tops," in the first place, is shrouded in some mystery, but during the last 20 years it has demonstrated its right to the title by coming out on top at the various revisions of the indefensible Schedule K. "Wool tops" are the product of the first processes of manufacturing worsted. The cost of turning wool into tops is very small compared with the cost of making wool cloth. And yet when the Dingley bill was framed in the Senate in 1897 "tops" came out on top with a duty as high as that put on finished cloth. There was a scandal over it and it was shown that the paid agent of the wool manufacturers had gained admittance to the secret sessions of the Finance Committee while the Dingley bill was being framed. The correspondence between this agent and his employer was published and showed that the agent had received explicit instructions to let the committee know what the employer needed on "tops." What he "needed" was to have "tops" kept out of the country, and the Dingley duty did this most effectively. This is shown by the fact that, although more than 200,000,000 pounds of wool was imported in 1910, only 2,248 pounds was in the form of "tops." This small quantity must have been brought in by mistake, for it was valued at only \$879, but the duty collected was \$1,243.

That illustrates the way American tariffs have been framed in the past. Are they being framed much better now? Look at "tops" in the Underwood bill. That Democratic measure as it passed the House last week put 15 per cent ad valorem on "tops." What does that mean? The price of foreign "tops" varies from 30 to 70 cents a pound. Fifteen per cent is consequently from 4½ to 10½ cents a pound. There are plenty of "tops" makers in this country who are looking for orders to turn wool into "tops" at 5 to 7 cents a pound, or, say, an average of 6 cents a pound. In other words, the Underwood duty on "tops" is from 75 to 175 per cent of the American price of converting wool into "tops." The Democratic bill that was killed by a veto last year put only 5 per cent protection on "tops"; this year the "tops" duty is 15 per cent.

The House of Representatives, ruled by a Democratic caucus, has passed a tariff bill with Schedule K in this indefensible form. Have our methods of revising tariffs been improved much since 1897? How does it happen that "tops" come out on top in 1913? What is the connection between legislation and the interests at the present time? Is it not time to provide a substitute for the revision of tariffs in secret by committees and the party caucus? The American people want to know.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the journal from which the Secretary has just read is published in the city of Boston, the center of the wool-manufacturing industry in this country. The paper is an old one, founded in 1833; it is independent in politics; it has a circulation of 95,000 daily; and is owned and published by Frank A. Munsey. I speak of these matters so that the article will not be understood at all to be a party expression, nor an expression of anyone in sympathy politically with this particular bill. It calls our attention to the fact that the subject of tops has furnished scandals heretofore in the construction of tariff bills, and we will do well in the preparation of the measure now under consideration to see that no room is given even for a suggestion of the character which the editorial conveys. I opened this discussion by remarking that the woolgrower, from my point of view, has no interest whatever in raising the duty prescribed by the amendment proposed by the Senate committee, and I think it can be demonstrated upon indubitable grounds that the rate proposed is altogether adequate to furnish whatever protection is necessary, even from a protective standpoint.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. HUGHES. I should like to ask the Senator if it is the practice now to scour wool where it is grown or if it is shipped in the grease?

Mr. WALSH. It is practically all shipped in the grease.

I desire, Mr. President, to say that if we accept the declaration of the Tariff Board in relation to the cost of producing tops there is no possibility of escaping the conclusion that 5 per cent is all the advantage that is necessary to cover any difference in the cost of production here and abroad. I am going to trespass upon the patience of the Senate long enough to read a few extracts which indicate the views of the Tariff Board. From page 640 I read as follows:

On the other hand, the commission rate for combing would, under normal conditions, cover not only interest on the plant, but whatever profit the combor is able to make besides. To a certain extent the interest and profit of the commission combor may be taken to offset the greater expense of the spinner who makes his own tops, so that the commission rate would approximate the actual net cost of the manufacturer who carried all the processes through in his own establishment.

The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] on yesterday thought that it was necessary to add something to the cost of making tops as given by the Tariff Board to cover interest upon the investment and other like expenses; but the Tariff Board itself says that all those items are taken into consideration by the commission man who does the combing for a fee, and therefore the charges made for custom combing necessarily measure the actual cost, and a slight profit, of course, is added. The Tariff Board continues:

Furthermore, the cost per pound of tops will vary according to the relative proportion of tops and noils secured from the process. The scale for commission combing in Bradford, England, differentiates its charges according to the percentage of the units. For instance, the charge for combing merino wools above 56s. quality is $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound where the proportion of tops to noils is 5 to 1 or over. The charge, then, increases as the proportion of noils increases. In general, however, the proportion of noils is seldom greater than 1 to 5—

So we can understand that the Bradford charge for combing is $4\frac{1}{2}$ cents per pound for merino wool—

and this may be taken as the regular commission charge for fine quality wools. On 56s. quality for "carding crossbreds," corresponding to our one-half blood, the charge is $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents; for 50s., corresponding to three-eighths blood, $3\frac{1}{4}$ cents; for 36s. to 46s., equivalent to our low one-quarter blood, the charge is 3 cents; and for low grade prepared, but not carded, the rate is $2\frac{1}{2}$ or 2 cents.

We have the English rate. Now, as to the American:

There is no standard scale for commission combing in this country. The following, however, may be taken as representative charges: Unwashed Territory wools, half blood or above, $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents a pound; Australian half blood and merino wools, not finer than 70s. quality, and domestic wools, half blood or above, 7 cents per pound; high-quarter blood to half blood, 6 cents (an extra charge is made on unwashed Territory wools); high-quarter blood, $5\frac{1}{2}$ cents; quarter-blood and common combing wools, 5 cents.

So that you have the combing charges in this country and in England for the purpose of comparison. The board continues:

In attempting to arrive at the cost of tops from a consideration of actual mill records for a given period of time, we have found the widest divergencies due to the difference in output. For a six-months period in one mill the average cost of production for all tops was only 4.28 cents per pound, while for another six-months period in the same mill running upon practically the same quality of tops the actual average cost was 9.37 cents a pound.

That is, in America.

The lowest actual cost we have found for making low-quarter blood tops in any given period was 3.24 cents for a six-months production on a greater than normal output. This, however, is an extreme case which could seldom be duplicated by any mill even under the most favorable circumstances.

Accordingly, Mr. President, the Tariff Board gives us the commission charge for combing in this country at $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents, running from $3\frac{3}{4}$ cents, the lowest cost, up to something in the neighborhood of 11 or 12 cents.

That is a matter of no great consequence, Mr. President. The important question is the labor cost, because we ought not to impose a tariff here as a premium upon inefficiency of methods. If the methods are so inefficient in this country as to increase the cost and add another element to the difference, as a matter of course no one will assert that we ought to take that into consideration; and even if we did the duty provided here would be adequate, as I shall show, even to take care of that.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. WARREN. Does the Senator think that we are so inefficient as that?

Mr. WALSH. I certainly do not. I propose to show directly—

Mr. WARREN. I myself have been rather distressed, I confess, at the very low estimate which the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], who is not now in the Chamber, have placed upon those who are engaged in the

woolgrowing and the wool-manufacturing industry in this country. I may be wrong, but I have labored under the impression that we had some very skillful men—

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I must interrupt the Senator. Will the Senator kindly quote anything that I have stated to the effect that anybody in this country was inefficient or of low caliber?

Mr. WARREN. If I understand the English language, the Senator was intimating it very broadly when I asked to interrupt him.

Mr. WALSH. I was reading from the report of the Tariff Board; I was not giving my views.

Mr. WARREN. I think the notes will not show that the Senator was reading at that particular moment from the report of the Tariff Board.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, if the Senator will call my attention to anything that I did say and it does not express my ideas, I shall gladly withdraw it or say that I was mistaken.

Mr. WARREN. The Senator on yesterday—

Mr. WALSH. I certainly do not care to have the charge made upon this floor that I have made any intimation of want of character or want of efficiency on the part of anybody connected with the manufacturing of wool in this country.

Mr. WARREN. I am very glad to have that declaration.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I have no special interest in this schedule beyond believing that there ought to be protection to wool and woolens; but I want, if the Senator will permit me, to observe that, as I have been listening to this debate and to other debates, I have noticed that whenever a question is in controversy Senators quote the Tariff Board. That seems to be authority from their point of view. Now, I make this observation simply for the purpose of expressing the hope that when we get to the final consideration of this bill we will create a tariff commission which will be valuable to us in future deliberations.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I interject here, before passing to the next subject in the argument, that in the practice of the law I have always made it a point to endeavor to establish my case, if I could, from evidence provided by the other side. I feel that the Tariff Board, as was suggested in the discussion here the other day, would probably, from the manner in which it was constituted, at least present the case not unfavorably to the doctrine of high duties upon these commodities.

Now let me go on. I was going to say, Mr. President, that in the regulation of the rate to my mind practically the only consideration which we are entitled to regard with any particular favor is the difference in the labor cost of making tops in this country and abroad. What is the difference? The Tariff Board gives it at 2.68 cents per pound, as shown by the table which is given at page 642, to which I adverted yesterday.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, is that both for washing and combing?

Mr. WALSH. For sorting, scouring, carding, and combing; the elements are all given. I will say now that the usually accurate Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] was quite in error yesterday in suggesting that this was the estimate only for low quarter-blood wool. The language of the—

Mr. LIPPITT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. WALSH. I do.

Mr. LIPPITT. I do not want to interfere with the course of the argument the Senator is making on the labor cost, but it is necessary, in considering that question, to bear in mind the distinction that is usually made in figures of that kind between what is called the direct labor cost and the indirect labor cost. If the Senator will look at the table—I think it is on the next page—where the board give the cost of combing tops at $7\frac{1}{2}$ cents, and will figure through to get the labor cost of all items—not merely the direct labor cost, but all the items of labor cost—he will find that they state that the labor cost is 4.27 cents a pound, although they do not include in that table any cost for sorting or scouring the wool, which is in itself somewhere in the neighborhood of $1\frac{1}{4}$ cents a pound. For the purpose of the discussion we are now engaged in, we must have the entire cost from the time of purchasing a pound of wool until the top is made. That is nowhere given in the Tariff Board report, except in a fragmentary way; it is nowhere collected as a whole. I merely wanted to make that statement.

Mr. WALSH. I recall that the Senator said something to that effect on yesterday; but I am giving the Senate the actual

labor cost of making tops, as given by the Tariff Board, embracing sorting, scouring, carding, and combing. Now, let me continue. They say with respect to this matter:

The above figures—

That is the figures 2.68 cents.

The above figures include tops of fine merino to low quarter bloods.

Then they continue:

A comparison of a large number of mills shows this to be true and that the general expense and fixed charges are nearly equal to the labor cost, so that, excluding interest, the cost of tops in a mill running full time may be taken as ranging from 4 to 5 cents per pound on tops from low quarter bloods to high quarter bloods.

Now I read from the next page—

Mr. SMOOT. That was the statement I made yesterday, and I read it from the Tariff Board report.

Mr. WALSH. Yes; I understand.

Mr. SMOOT. And I do not believe I misquoted a word from that report.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, on yesterday I said in the course of the discussion of this subject by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. LIPPITT] that the Tariff Board gave the labor cost of making tops in this country at 2.68 cents, and the Senator erroneously remarked in that connection that that was the cost in the case of low quarter bloods only. I am simply endeavoring to have the RECORD straight.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have not the RECORD here, and do not know whether it is in the RECORD this morning or not. I wish to say to the Senator, however, that I read from page 642 of the Tariff Board's report, and stated that—

A comparison of a large number of mills shows this to be true, and that the general expense and fixed charges are nearly equal to the labor cost; so that, excluding interest, the cost of tops in a mill running full time may be taken as ranging from 4 to 5 cents a pound on tops from low quarter bloods to high quarter bloods.

The Senator from North Carolina asked me what "low quarter bloods" and "high quarter bloods" meant. I said it was the designation of the grade of wool taken from certain grades of sheep.

Mr. WALSH. Yes. Now that we have the matter straight, let us not follow it any longer. The Senator was in error in attaching the comment to which he refers to the figures—2.68— which I gave.

Let me continue:

A comparison of the actual records of two similar plants—one in England and the other in the United States—showed the combing cost for the period of output in question (not including sorting) to be 2 cents in England and 4.27 cents in this country. The American plant, however, was making a slightly higher grade of tops. From the figures in both cases interest and depreciation were deducted, as the English charges were so disproportionately low as to show a difference in book-keeping method on these items.

Another comparison from actual records in England and the United States showed for a year's period an average of receipts of 4 cents a pound in England and 7 cents a pound in the United States; while the profit per pound in the two cases was practically the same, it being very close to 1 cent per pound in each case. This is not an unusual profit per pound in England, and in the case just cited it amounted to 25 per cent of the commission charge in England, as against 14.3 per cent in the United States.

It is further interesting to note that the direct labor cost, excluding labor for repairs, power plant, etc., was in the case of these two plants 69 cents per 100 pounds in England and \$1.76 in the United States, being slightly less than 25 per cent of the total cost in England and 33 per cent of the total cost in the United States. Other estimates were furnished the board in England to the effect that the direct labor cost is not more than 20 per cent of the total.

Mr. President, when the total labor cost of making a pound of tops is 2.68 cents, what shall we say is the difference in the labor cost in this country and in England? If, as I suggested yesterday, you can get labor in England for one-half what it costs here, the difference in the labor cost can not exceed 1½ cents per pound.

What will a duty of 5 per cent ad valorem produce; that is to say, what is the actual import price of tops? The report accompanying this bill, sent here for our guidance, gives the unit as something like 80 cents. But we should be entirely wrong in assuming that that would be the price were the importations considerable in number. The present rate is and was intended to be substantially prohibitive. But the Tariff Board gives us the cost of tops, or what the market price was.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the 81 cents per pound given as the cost in the tables accompanying the bill to which the Senator has referred does not include the duty. That is the invoice cost of the product.

Mr. WALSH. Certainly. I am speaking of the invoice price.

At page 645 of the Tariff Board report is a table which gives the fluctuations in the cost of tops in this country and abroad. The domestic half-bloods since 1907 have ranged from 65 cents to 80 cents per pound. The domestic three-eighths bloods have ranged from about 57 to about 68 cents per pound. The foreign

three-eighths bloods have ranged from 58 to 73 cents per pound. The general range is from 45 cents for the very lowest grade to about 87 cents for the very highest grade.

So that we have here the actual cost of tops, the foreign price and the domestic price. The foreign price is what we are chiefly concerned in now. That is the invoice price, which runs from 40 cents for the lowest grades up to about 85 to 90 cents for the highest grades, the general average being somewhere between 60 and 70 cents per pound, perhaps.

But let us take the lowest grades, and the duty charge is 5 per cent of 40 cents, or 2 cents a pound. It must be conceded upon this record that the actual cost of producing low-grade tops from the low-grade wools does not exceed altogether from 4 to 5 cents, or possibly as high as 6, and the labor cost is not more than 20 per cent of the total cost of the product. So your very lowest grades are amply protected by a 5 per cent duty.

Take the higher grades, commanding 80 cents a pound. Five per cent of 80 cents is 4 cents per pound. No one pretends that the difference in the labor cost, or indeed the total labor cost for that matter, reaches anything like 4 cents per pound.

Mr. WARREN. Oh, Mr. President, I think the Senator should temper that remark. Men have claimed it. The Senator says no one will claim it. I do not believe he wants to be put in that position. It has been claimed by a great many men. It has been claimed here on the floor of the Senate, for that matter.

Mr. WALSH. Perhaps, then, I had better say that it is impossible to reach the conclusion from the evidence before us that the labor cost in the case of the production of the highest grade of tops is greater than 4 cents.

Mr. WARREN. If the Senator will allow me, I wish to say that I myself am neither discrediting the Tariff Board report nor am I undertaking to adopt it; but I do say that in order to represent it fully one must take the tables together, as stated a moment ago by the Senator from Rhode Island; and if we are figuring out tops or anything else we must take the different sections together.

There have been quotations made from that report by various Senators which remind me of the old saying that you can prove anything, any theory or doctrine, from the Bible if you are permitted to select parts of sentences, and so forth. But I have not been able to figure out—and I have submitted the matter to a great many people—any such slight cost as the Senator says.

Will the Senator permit me to go a little further? In opening his remarks the Senator cited the Boston Journal. Of course the Senator will not undertake to say that that is especially a wool periodical.

Mr. WALSH. I did not offer it as such.

Mr. WARREN. It is merely one of the daily papers. I have read it, off and on, for a great many years. It changes ownership often, and changes its politics and ideas. I do not wonder that the Journal should speak of it as a scandal in former times when the rate was so very high, as I quoted it here. It was very much like the shoddy matter we spoke of yesterday, which was evidently adopted with the idea of keeping out tops, because—

Mr. WALSH. Let me say to the Senator from Wyoming that I really supposed he was going simply to make a remark. I do not feel as if—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana decline to yield further?

Mr. WARREN. I do not wish to trespass upon the Senator's time.

Mr. WALSH. I simply wish to say that it would be scarcely fair to get into a long discussion with me in the midst of my argument.

Mr. WARREN. I myself have been rather liberal in permitting others to break in on me, but I shall await my time.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, inasmuch as it seems to be absolutely demonstrated from the evidence before us that the rate carried by this bill is adequate, I wish to direct attention for a few moments to a consideration of the persons who will get the benefit of any increase over the rates provided by the amendment proposed by the Finance Committee. The fact is that if they are not the exclusive manufacturers, practically the only firms manufacturing tops for commercial purposes in this country are the Arlington Mills and the American Woolen Co. They manufacture them for sale to other spinners and weavers.

In the years 1895 and 1896 the Arlington Mills, with which Mr. William Whitman, prominent in connection with tariff legislation for 40 years, was intimately associated, constructed what he represented, and accurately, too, in a letter to Mr.

Dingley, to be an enormous mill for the manufacture of tops. The way in which he came to build that mill contains an impressive lesson to us in connection with this tariff measure.

The Wilson bill of 1894 had been passed, reducing materially, as does this bill, the duties upon manufactured wools. It then became necessary for the Arlington Mills to look about to see whether new economies could not be introduced into the business in order that they might meet the conditions which then confronted them. The result was that the Arlington Mills were constructed. Mr. Whitman was the chief factor in that great work, and he naturally felt very proud of it. He had every cause to be. He felt so proud of it that he wrote a book about it, called *Tops*, a copy of which I have on my desk before me. The considerations that prompted the establishment of that mill are set forth as follows in the book:

The management of the Arlington Mills was first brought to the investigation of the foreign methods of specialization in the summer of 1894, when legislation was pending to remove the duty on foreign wool, and otherwise so to change the status of the manufacture as to amount to an economic revolution. It appeared necessary to prepare to adapt American methods to new conditions; and the treasurer of the Arlington Mills visited Europe during the summer in question and acquired all the information possible upon the system of manufacturing there prevailing. He became convinced that to secure the best possible results in this country radical changes were necessary, beginning at the very foundation. It was made clear to him that the most successful combed-wool manufacturers abroad depended primarily upon the cheapness and perfection with which their wool tops were produced, and also that this cheapness and perfection combined were only possible when the manufacture was specialized on a large scale.

And therefore the mills were built. He says further concerning their capacity:

It is calculated that there can be delivered from this building, with these improved expediting processes, 300,000 pounds of tops a week, requiring for their production between 600,000 and 800,000 pounds of greasy wool per week. The top mill is thus capable of consuming the entire wool clip of the States of Ohio and California, which, next to Texas, are the two largest woolgrowing States of the Union. The fleeces of 20,000 sheep will pass through its machinery every day that it is in full operation. Its capacity is equal to one-eighth of the total wool clip of the United States.

Mr. President, the connection of Mr. Whitman with the duty upon wool tops is a matter which has been presented to this body upon a number of occasions. The letters which passed between him and Mr. North, who was introduced into the privacy of the Senate Finance Committee while it was engaged in the preparation of the Dingley bill, were read by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] at an early stage of the consideration of this bill. I do not purpose to go over those letters now, but I am going to invite the attention of this body to some further revelations in relation to that matter which have lately come to the attention of the public.

Before going into that I wish to refer to these letters, showing the individual and personal interest of Mr. Whitman in this particular schedule.

In a letter to Mr. North, under date of April 6, 1897, he said:

Mr. North, no change ought to be made in the top schedule. It is right just as it stands. It is an enormous reduction from the McKinley law. No possible legislation in connection with the woolen schedule could be so dangerous to the woolen industry as legislation that would favor the importation of tops, and all the representatives of the woolgrowers would oppose legislation that would in any way favor the importation of tops.

Of course they would, under a system pursuant to which wool is not admitted free.

I depend upon you to look out for my interest in this regard. You know how anxious I have been that tops should be made dutiable at less rates than the McKinley law, and you also know how important it is, not only to me but to the whole worsted industry of the United States, that such rates of duty should be imposed upon tops as will enable them to be made here and not be imported from foreign countries. If there is a single point in reference to this that you do not understand, you ought to communicate with me at once, so that it may be explained. There would be no difficulty in my satisfying the members of the subcommittee on this point, and if there is the slightest danger of any change I must see these gentlemen before it is too late.

If they understand the matter properly, they will make no change. The prosperity of the woolen industry in this country depends wholly upon the ability of the domestic manufacturers to manufacture the tops here. What a ridiculous position we would be in under any legislation that would favor importing tops and discontinuing making them here.

A little explanation of this matter is necessary. Under the Dingley law tops fell under a clause which provided for a duty upon all manufactures of wool advanced in any degree beyond the scouring stage. Mr. Whitman thought it would be advisable to have a paragraph dealing specifically with tops. He proposed such a measure, and it was included in the bill; but when it came to the Senate, for reasons which will be adverted to at some other time, when I hope to address the Senate at length upon this subject, it was excised, and the provision in the McKinley bill was incorporated in the Dingley bill.

When the bill got into conference Mr. Whitman was exceedingly solicitous and anxious indeed about the provision which

covered the subject of tops, and he wrote Mr. North as follows—I read only the postscript of a letter dated July 10, 1897:

P. S.—I am unable to go to Washington and have no one to look out for my interests there but yourself, and I depend upon you. Of course Messrs. Aldrich and Dingley will do all they can, but I depend upon your letting them know what I need. I depend upon you. Dress goods, yarns, and tops.

So, Mr. President, we have learned, I think, who the people are who are most vitally interested in the duty upon tops, for which such a struggle is made upon this floor. But a thing to which I desire to invite attention now, which was revealed a long time ago, is that this same Mr. North, who at that time was secretary of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, drawing from that organization, which was vitally interested in this wool schedule, a salary of \$4,000 a year, was so fortunate as to have his services in the Finance Committee so highly appreciated by his employers that a number of them gathered together and made him a gift of \$5,000 shortly after the passage of the Dingley Act. In further appreciation of his arduous work they increased his salary on the 1st of January following, 1898, from \$4,000 to \$6,000 a year. He drew that salary of \$6,000 during the year 1898. At about that time a very determined effort was made by Mr. Whitman to have this man installed in the responsible position of Director of the Census. It was unavailing. But in the month of July of the year 1898, while he was still drawing a salary of \$6,000 a year from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, he had friends powerful enough to secure him the place of chairman of the Industrial Commission recently created. He held that position for about a year, when, in 1899, although it was felt that a man directly interested in any statistics that would be prepared that would be made the basis of future tariff legislation should not be installed in the position of director, he was made chief statistician of the Census. He held that position until the year 1903, when he became Director of the Census. Mind you, all this time he was drawing a salary of \$4,000 a year from the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, drawing meanwhile a salary from the Federal Government in these responsible positions.

Mr. Whitman very frankly admitted upon the witness stand that while Mr. North was thus engaged in aid of the majority members of the Senate Finance Committee, if he was, in fact, then in the employ of the Federal Government, it would be utterly wrong for him to convey to Mr. Whitman or to anyone else from day to day the transactions of that committee. His actions in that regard were, however, excused upon the ground that he was not in the employ of the Government at all and was receiving no compensation from it. Yet it was disclosed that although he got no salary from the Government for his services, his daily expenses all of the time he was thus employed, his living expenses here, and his transportation from this city to the city of Boston and back were all paid out of the Treasury, and the vouchers are on file in the office of the Secretary of the United States Senate.

So I say we ought to regard with a great deal of care and a great deal of caution any suggestion that the duty on tops ought to be elevated to 15 per cent, or anything like 15 per cent, or anything in advance of the rate proposed by the Senate Finance Committee, which is entirely adequate, as appears from the record made by the Tariff Board, to take care of this particular item.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I am sorry to see that the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has allowed the old and reasonable prejudice, if prejudice is ever reasonable, created by the old very high rates on tops, to influence him as far as it seems to have done. The rates at the time of which he has spoken were 24½ cents per pound plus 30 per cent ad valorem on one class of tops and 36½ cents per pound plus 30 per cent on another, which is quite different from 1½ cents to 4 cents per pound, as proposed by the present measure under the amendment of the Senate committee, which is only 5 per cent ad valorem.

I hope the Senator will permit me to refer for a moment to an interruption of yesterday with which the Senator favored me when I had the floor, in which he inquired just when I had changed my mind and consented to the idea that we could submit to a lower tariff rate on wool and woollens. I could hardly see how that information would be necessary to the Senator or how it bore on the question then at issue, and, of course, I was not willing to consider that it was thrown in to embarrass me; but I could not help thinking at the time how natural it is for us to change our minds. Sometimes it becomes very evident that new converts are a good deal more radical than the old-timers when a man changes his religion or his politics or his ideas on finance or public economy.

The Senator, if I remember rightly—and I think I have the documents here—participated with the Wool Growers' Association, I think at Helena, the capital of his great State, when it met in 1903, just before the matter of the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill was to come up in the Congress of the United States. He was there made a member of the committee on resolutions, performed his duty very satisfactorily, and, as I learn, made quite an extended, and, as he always does, able speech. His partner—I believe it was his partner, Mr. Penwill—was also there, and participated. As I am informed, they unanimously adopted, among other resolutions, this one:

Resolved, That we approve the present tariff on wool and hides, and deprecate any attempt to alter or modify the same.

This was the Dingley tariff bill.

Mr. President, as Montana is a neighboring and adjoining State and as she has industries that lie alongside and are similar to those of Wyoming, and undoubtedly these two are the two greatest wool and sheep growing States in the Union, I naturally looked with much interest to what was done at that meeting.

In my duties here in the consideration of the various measures that come up, while I always wish to be first for the country at large, I nevertheless think it is no discredit to be especially anxious to provide for the State I have the honor in part to represent and those near it, and especially those interested in the same lines of business.

Standing as I did here, backed up by a resolution from a committee made up from both Democratic and Republican members, of which the Senator from Montana was a most distinguished Democratic member, and a greatly honored member, I, with others, stood by the tariff bill as they asked us to stand by it.

It is difficult to say just when a man changes his mind, as I explained yesterday; but while the Senator was asking me when I changed my mind, possibly he would have been willing to tell us when he changed his. At that time I was in a responsible position here, and if he had changed his mind soon enough and had informed me then of a different opinion, I might have voted differently on the duty on tops, which were at the extravagant figure I have read—more than fifteen times as high as in this bill. It is always honorable to change one's mind.

I am sorry that in thus changing his mind the Senator has become embittered, as it seems to me—and I say it with all respect—against the item of tops, because, forsooth, in times past it has been an article of scandal, and there have been personal differences, and even while I do not charge it, disreputable practices. I have no interest in all or any of that.

I have no interest whatever in wool manufacturing and no interest in tops except for the woolgrower. I plead for them now. If the Senator thinks that his State believes that there should be no tariff on wool, of course he is in the right path to take the course he does. But I beg to say that I have given the matter great attention. I have heard from a great many of our woolgrowers; I read the papers that come from Montana; I read the observations that are made on the actions of their Senators here. I am always pained to see anything that is not commendatory. I do not believe that woolgrowers as a whole, in that State or any other, feel as the Senator does about it—that the woolgrowers are in no danger because of the small 5 per cent tariff duty on tops.

Mr. SMOOT and Mr. JAMES addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not intend to keep the Senator from Kentucky off the floor for many minutes.

Mr. JAMES. Go ahead.

Mr. SMOOT. I do not propose to say very much upon this top question at this particular time. I will, however, when I discuss the substitute that I have proposed for this schedule, go into that question in detail.

As the distinguished Senator from Montana has read a newspaper article taken from the Boston Journal in relation to the top question and the duties required upon that article, stating that the Journal was established in 1893 as I heard it, I can not help but take the time of the Senate long enough to read what the Wool Record, of Bradford, England, thinks upon this subject.

I know that it is very unpopular at this time to have an American citizen who may be interested in any kind of business have anything whatever to say about the rates in a tariff bill. The importers and foreign manufacturers are the ones listened to to-day. I want to read from the Wool Record, and I wish to say to the Senators that the Wool Record was established in

the year 1837, nearly 60 years before the Boston Journal was established.

Mr. WALSH. No; the Boston Journal was established in 1833. It beat it by four years.

Mr. SMOOT. The Wool Record is located at Bradford, the great wool center of England. The Boston Journal, as the Senator said, is located at Boston, one of the great wool centers of the United States. I will read the editorial of this great journal in its issue of July 3, 1913. I received it from England but a few days ago.

The cable intelligence that the Democratic caucus have decided to recommend a further reduction in the duties appertaining to Schedule K, and to place tops, noils, wastes, and blankets on the free list has this week formed the subject of much discussion in wool circles, both in London and Bradford, and visions both bright and otherwise have been seen. We certainly think that the news need not be taken too seriously. Of course, some are for and others are against such a bill, but we doubt if these partly and fully manufactured articles will be placed on such a favorable footing. If such a thing had to happen as that tops should be put on the free list, it would mean very little wool being shipped to the United States, the bulk of American users preferring the combed article. It is hard to conceive that even the Democratic section of the House of Representatives would favor such a move, for it would at once bring to a complete standstill a good deal of American textile machinery, besides leading to the throwing out of work of a large number of employees. Even with only a 15 per cent duty on tops, large shipments of that commodity are certain to be made, for we can not see that the United States top makers can successfully compete with Bradford firms on so low a duty. We are convinced that whatever duties ultimately become law, a big trade is going to be done in something, and everything seems to indicate that large shipments will be made in practically all lines of wool and textiles. Naturally the idea of placing tops on the free list finds no approval among American wool buyers in Coleman Street, for they see that it will be impossible to produce tops on anything like a basis at which Bradford top makers will be able to offer them.

Mr. President, that is the latest issue of the Wool Record that I have received, and it says that even with 15 per cent duty there will be large quantities of tops imported into this country.

At this time I am not going into the question of the Tariff Board's report and show by it the actual difference of cost of making tops in this country compared with that of making them in foreign countries, but when I do I do not propose to take the lowest priced top made in this country and compare it with the highest priced made in a foreign country.

I received last night the quotations on tops at Bradford, England. With wool the highest it has been for years on account of the shortage of the wool crop of last year of 240,000,000 pounds, tops are quoted to-day at Bradford, England, at from 30 cents to about 62 cents per pound. A great quantity of tops that would be shipped into this country would be the grade of tops that would produce the number of yarns that enters into the great bulk of the goods made in this country. All will concede that to be a fact, and the Bradford price would be from 35 to 40 cents per pound on this class of tops. Five per cent on 35 cents is 1½ cents a pound, and 5 per cent upon 40 cents is 2 cents a pound.

The Senator wanted us to believe that the only difference in the cost of producing tops in this country and in England was the cost of labor. Mr. President, that can not be true. There is not a mill that does not cost more to erect in this country than it costs in England. All the machinery that is used for the manufacturing of tops costs more in this country than in England. The interest upon the increase of both is a charge against the cost of tops. The incidental expenses, the interest charges, the overhead charges, and all the expenses incident to maintaining and running an establishment of that kind are higher in this country than they are abroad. All these things must be taken into consideration instead of merely the question of the difference in the cost of labor in arriving at the difference of cost of making tops.

Therefore, Mr. President, I believe that with the 5 per cent duty upon tops it will not only allow tops to be imported into this country in great quantities, displacing American wool, but it will have an effect upon the price paid for American wool, for every pound of tops that is imported into this country means the displacement of at least 3 pounds of American wool in the grease; and if they can be imported for less than they can be made here, just the amount that they can be imported less than they can be made here in this country will affect the price of American wool.

The American woolgrower has but one market, and that market is the woolen manufacturer in this country. If he is placed in a position where he can not purchase wool, of course it is going to affect the price that the farmer receives for that article.

I suppose there is nothing that can be said or no plea which can be made by any human being that will change the mind of the committee reporting this amendment into the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS. No; we are ready to vote.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator from Colorado shakes his head and says, "No; we are ready to vote." We have heard that statement in this Chamber beginning the very first day that the bill was discussed and repeated until this moment, when the Senator from Colorado reiterates it, positive of his position, knowing that he has the votes back of him to force it through, no matter what the result may be to the farmer, the wool-grower, or the manufacturer of this country.

Mr. JAMES. Mr. President, I placed in the RECORD about an hour since a table showing the number of sheep produced in the various States and the number of pounds of wool produced and the number of pounds of wool consumed. I then answered some questions submitted by the Senator from Utah and some other Senators, and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] took the floor and I went down to eat lunch. The Senator from Kansas rose and made this observation:

I see the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has escaped. I desired to make an interrogatory of him before he left.

Mr. President, I am frank to admit that if I had known the Senator from Kansas was going to speak perhaps I should have escaped. I do not think he ought to find fault with anyone who seeks refuge from the Chamber when he proceeds to speak. But he ought not to have charged me at that particular moment with fleeing from the Chamber because of the fact that I feared he intended to speak or propound a question to me. I had no idea of it. The truth of it is the question he propounded is not a new one with the Senator. It was propounded to me yesterday by the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN].

But the question he wanted to ask me was this, that as I had made it easy for the people in his State and in mine to know how many pounds of wool were produced there, to know how many pounds of wool had to be imported, if any, to supply the people there, I should have also supplied a table showing the number of manufacturers of clothing in the various States, and then the number of people who wear clothes.

Mr. President, I should be very glad to do that. I should be very glad to submit such a table. The Senator can do it himself, but if he will not do it, I am willing to do it for him—to take this bill under consideration in the Senate and to show the rates of the present law upon woolen clothes and to show the reduction made upon those same articles in our bill, a reduction from 100 and more per cent down to an average of 25 per cent.

I am willing to leave to the people of Kansas or Kentucky, or any other State in the American Union, what they shall say on a vote that will be cast against this bill for the maintenance of the existing rates of the present law.

Now take the State of Kansas. Kansas in 1910, according to the census, had 1,690,940 people. She produced 1,312,000 pounds of wool and her people consumed 10,829,074 pounds of wool.

In other words, there had to be imported into the State of Kansas 9,500,000 pounds of wool more than was produced there in order to supply the inhabitants of that State.

I put this in the RECORD in order to make it easy for the Senator from Kansas to point out to the people the pounds of wool produced there, the pounds of wool consumed by the people there, and then let him figure up for that constituency that have to pay this burden just how much additional tax he places upon them in order to give protection, as he calls it, to an industry that had, in 1910, 272,000 sheep, or an average of 1½ sheep to each farmer.

There is not a great civilized government in this world that does not place wool upon the free list. It is a great basic product, and every time you give a protective tariff upon wool you give to the manufacturer a compensatory duty of four to one upon the cloth, and all of it has to be paid by the people who use the product of the wool industry.

Mr. President, it might also be asked of the Senator from Kansas why his party provides a tariff upon cotton clothes and places cotton upon the free list. This bill places the great necessities of life upon the free list and the Senator can not make me shrink from a comparison of the number of factories and those who consume clothes, as provided by this bill under consideration.

But I beg only that accompanying that shall be the rates of the existing law and the proposed rates of this bill and then let the American people say whether or not a vote cast against this bill is a proper one.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, the Senator from Kentucky has very kindly stated, and I presume with accuracy, the number of pounds of wool that are produced in the State of Kansas, and then has estimated the number of pounds of wool that are consumed in the form of clothing by the people of that State.

I desire to say to him that in this bill he removes the tax that would serve as a protection for the men who produce the

wool, and he still imposes a tax upon every pound of wool that is consumed by the people of that State. Instead of relieving the people of Kansas from the tax that is imposed upon the clothing that they wear, he takes from them the protection from the product which they produce and retains the tax upon the clothing that they wear.

And because some of us contend that the man who produces the wool should be treated with as much consideration as the man who takes the wool and weaves it into cloth or transforms it into a garment, the Senator assumes to reprimand us for such an attempt. This schedule, from the time the wool leaves the farmer's hands until it is consumed and worn out by his family, there is a protective tax imposed upon every process. Every man who touches it from the day that it leaves the farm until it goes into the gutter has a protective duty on his work. The only man who is not given consideration in the handling of wool is the man who grows the sheep upon the American farm.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BRISTOW. I do.

Mr. LANE. I should like to say that I am becoming confused in this argument. Yesterday I heard, or thought I did, an advertisement spread into the RECORD by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] showing that the woolen manufacturers of England were going to make an onslaught in this country with manufactured woolen articles and that the result was going to be disastrous to the American people; and here at this time we hear the Senator from Kansas state the opposite of that. I say I am becoming confused.

Mr. BRISTOW. The Senator need not become confused as to what I have said. I am not complaining of the duties fixed upon the clothing here, and I am not asking that they be increased. I am not complaining here that the manufacturer of woolen goods has not been properly protected. I do not know whether he has or not; but this I do know, that he has been given consideration, he has not been placed on the free list, and I have been arraigned here because I am contending that the farmer has as much right to consideration from the American Congress as the manufacturer who takes the farm product as his raw material and begins to transform it into other products.

When the wool is taken to the factory the first process is to wash it and get the grease out of it, and the man who washes it and takes the grease out of it is given a protective duty of 15 per cent on the labor he expends in taking the grease out of that wool. Then it is combed into what they call tops, that we have been hearing so much about this morning, and the man who produces the tops from the wool has in this bill a protective duty of 5 per cent. It is contended here by men who claim to be experts that that is not enough. I do not know whether it is or not, but he gets a duty; though it may be small, he gets something.

And then you go to yarn, and this bill gives the man who takes the tops and transforms them into yarn 15 per cent protection for his work and labor.

Then the next step is the making of cloths, knit fabrics, and so forth, and the man who takes the yarn and transforms it into cloths and knit fabrics gets 35 per cent in this bill. I presume that that 35 per cent represents some of the tax that has been laid upon the yarns and the tops. In that 35 per cent I suppose is included some compensation to the man who weaves the cloth for the tax that has been paid upon the yarn from which the cloth is made. If the Senator's logic is good as to the farmer—that is, if a duty on raw wool increases the duty to be placed on cloth because it has to be carried into the cloth duty as a compensatory duty—the same ought to be true as to the duty on yarns and tops. He therefore puts a higher duty on the cloth because there is a duty on the yarn and the tops.

Mr. JAMES. Will the Senator yield a moment?

Mr. BRISTOW. From his point of view, therefore, should he not take the duty off the yarn because by so doing he could reduce the duty on cloth?

Mr. JAMES. Why did not the Senator follow that policy upon cotton cloths when his side of the Chamber were making a tariff? With the cotton of the farm harder to produce than wool, in a hotter climate, under circumstances where toil is really burdensome, why was it the Senator put cotton on the free list and put a tax upon the manufactured product?

Mr. BRISTOW. Because the American people produce more cotton than any other country in the world and export over a million pounds, and it would not have done him any good to put it there.

Mr. JAMES. I have heard it stated here several times, and have heard it advocated in the other House, that if there was a

tariff upon a certain character of cotton produced in this country—long staple cotton, sea-island cotton—it would mean many million dollars to those who raise cotton in this country.

Mr. BRISTOW. I have not given that careful consideration, but it might be to the interest of this country to put a tariff on the long-staple cotton. I am not ready to say it would; I would want to give it consideration. If it is for the best interest of our country to place it there, I would vote for it without any hesitation.

Mr. SMOOT. I suppose the Senator remembers very well that there was an amendment offered to the Payne-Aldrich bill placing a duty upon that same class of cotton, and it would have been placed upon that class of cotton in the Payne-Aldrich bill if it had not been for the Democratic vote on the other side of the Chamber.

Mr. JAMES. It is the first time that I have heard that the Democrats were in control of the Senate until the 4th of last March. I thought the Republican Party had been in control of the Senate for the last 16 years.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I will advise the Senator that if it had not been for Democratic votes many of the duties concerning which he complains in the present law would not have been there, and one of them was a duty on iron ore.

Mr. JAMES. I can tell the Senator another thing—

Mr. BRISTOW. Iron ore was placed on the dutiable list by Democratic votes in this Chamber, and the present chairman of the Committee on Finance cast one of them.

Mr. JAMES. It is the first time that I have heard that the majority party undertook to escape its responsibility by trying to throw the burden upon the minority party, but the Senator—

Mr. BRISTOW. Oh—

Mr. JAMES. Just a moment. I want to say to the Senator that if the people had not elected a majority of Republicans to the Senate four years ago there would not have been on the statute books this iniquitous and burdensome tariff law that robs ninety-nine men in America for the benefit of one.

Mr. BRISTOW. It may be that the Senator is not advised as to the revision of the tariff in 1909, but I think he is; and I think the Senator knows that when some of us were fighting here for reduced duties and against duties that we did not believe were justified, we would have been successful if the Democratic Party—Democratic Senators, I should say; I am not charging this to the Democratic Party or to the Republican Party; I am talking about conditions as they exist—if Democratic Senators had not voted for duties then which they are denouncing now. As I say, the duty on iron ore is one of them and lumber was another.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Kansas yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. BRISTOW. I yield to the Senator for a moment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am ready, Mr. President, to accept the statement made by Senators who represent the adverse party. The conditions governing the production of sea-island cotton, in my judgment, have now reached a stage that, in order to properly grow and market the sea-island cotton in this country, some fair degree of protection ought to be put upon it; and I will announce in the presence of Democratic Senators that I am ready, if they will add a paragraph of that kind to the bill, to vote for adequate protection of sea-island cotton now and hereafter. I believe that would be just. I happen to have had occasion at one time in my life to look into the matter, and I believe if the Senator from Kansas had the information which some of us possess on that question he would answer in the affirmative as readily as have I.

Mr. STONE. Now, Mr. President, I should like to dispose of these two paragraphs.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas has not yielded the floor.

Mr. BRISTOW. I am not through at all, I wish the Senator to understand. I have a few more things which I expect to say. I believe I had reached the production of cloth, upon which a duty of 35 per cent is imposed by this bill.

We next come to blankets, upon which a duty of 25 per cent is imposed. I suppose the committee found it necessary to put a duty of 25 per cent upon blankets because there is a duty upon yarns. Of course if there had been no duty upon yarns or upon tops it would not have been necessary to impose a duty of 25 per cent upon blankets; but imposing a duty upon the raw material out of which the cloths and blankets are made—that is, the yarns—it is necessary to impose a higher duty on the cloth and blankets, in order to compensate the

manufacturer of blankets and of cloth for the duty that he has to pay when he buys his yarns.

Mr. JAMES. We put some blankets upon the free list, as the Senator from Kansas doubtless has observed.

Mr. BRISTOW. I notice that there are some few, which are probably made mostly of cotton.

Mr. SMOOT. That was a political rate.

Mr. JAMES. All of yours were political rates.

Mr. BRISTOW. Now, we come to women's and children's dress goods, and upon women's and children's dress goods the committee find it desirable to impose a duty of 35 per cent ad valorem—quite a comfortable duty, more than a third of the value. I suppose that this duty of 35 per cent is found necessary because of the duty imposed upon yarns from which the cloth and the dress goods are made. So, in order to protect the manufacturer of yarns, a higher duty—a duty of 35 per cent—is imposed upon the clothes which the women and children wear.

Then we come to ready-made clothing. As to the millions of pounds of cloth—if I may have the attention of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] about this matter, in which he has become so interested in regard to the people of Kansas—as to the millions of pounds of wool which the people of Kansas have consumed, every pound of it is burdened by a tax put there by the Senator from Kentucky by his vote and which now meets his approval. There is a compensatory duty imposed on every pound of this clothing because the Senator from Kentucky found it necessary to give a protective duty to the manufacturer of yarn; but he holds up his hands in horror when a Senator from Kansas asks that the producer of wool be treated with the same consideration with which the Senator from Kentucky has treated the manufacturers of cloth and of yarn.

You can go through this bill and take up every item and every paragraph in it that relates to farm products and that principle prevails, and there is no schedule that manifests more clearly its indefensible discrimination than does Schedule K.

Schedule K was attacked by a great Senator, Mr. Dolliver, upon this floor four years ago, and his speech on that occasion has had many feeble imitations here since this session began. Many Senators have tried to pattern after it and have read into the RECORD the same letters, have undertaken to formulate the same denunciations against Schedule K, and yet these same Senators in this bill take those reductions off the protection which the farmer got in Schedule K of the present law and mighty little of it off of the protection which the manufacturers got in that law. When you deduct from this measure the duty on wool and the compensatory duties that were imposed on cloth and clothing because of that duty on wool, which it was alleged simply made the manufacturer good, you leave the actual protective duties to the manufacturer very much where they were.

I am not one who believes that those compensatory duties that were imposed in Schedule K of the present law were justified; I do not believe that they were imposed in a proper way; I think they were far greater than they ought to have been; but when you take them out and come to the protective duties pure and simple which are given the manufacturers in this bill the reductions are not so important as to justify the proud boast that we have so frequently heard by the friends of this measure. So that the burden of the reduction which is claimed here is taken not from the manufacturer but from the producer of wool itself.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] spoke with force and commendable emphasis in denouncing the connection of Mr. North with the making of the tariff bill four years ago, but I have not been much interested in the discussion of Mr. North's connection with the tariff bill since the exposition made by former Senator Dolliver, of Iowa, because the power which he exhibited in exposing the scandal connected with that has never been approached by any Senator upon this floor. It is only the Senators who have come into the Chamber since that speech was delivered who have ever presumed to follow it up and to undertake to imitate it.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Montana, who has so vigorously denounced Mr. North, to the fact that this bill, which he is supporting with such earnestness, preserves a protective duty upon every item in which Mr. North was interested. There is not a manufacturer whom Mr. North represented here or anywhere else who has not a protective duty in this bill on the product which he turns from his looms. The only man who greatly suffers from the action of the framers of this bill is the producer of wool, in whom Mr. North has no interest.

Mr. President, I did not expect to discuss the wool tariff. The duty on wool is not one that touches my constituency with

much personal interest. Kansas is not a large wool-producing State. I have made these remarks because I believe that this bill is discriminatory and unjust; and, furthermore, I do not want anyone to believe for a moment that he can force me to vote for a bill which I believe is wrong, for the reason there is now a law upon the statute books of which I disapprove and against which I voted. If such reasoning as that were to prevail, then a man would be compelled to vote for things which he believed were wrong, because a wrong had been done at another time in the consideration of another measure.

The question for consideration here is not whether this is a better or a worse bill than the present law, but whether or not this is a just bill and one that is worthy of the approval of Senators who are called upon to approve or condemn it. So far as I am concerned, when I cast my vote on this measure, it will be an indorsement or a failure to indorse the measure on its merits. I will not be coerced into voting for things that I believe to be iniquitous, because the bill contains a number of things for which I should be glad to vote if I were given the opportunity.

While I am on my feet, I may say that for some reason that has not yet been explained, those in control of the national legislation this year have seen fit to group these tariff schedules into one bill, instead of bringing them in as separate bills as they did a year ago.

If this bill had been brought in schedule by schedule, as has been advocated for some years by leaders on both sides of the aisle of this Chamber, there are schedules here which, with some slight changes I would gladly support; but because the majority have apparently seen fit to crowd them into one bill, in order to force through Congress legislation which I believe to be unjust and pernicious, will not be sufficient reason for me to support such iniquitous legislation. Why could we not have had schedule by schedule presented to us as we had a year ago? Why this change? If that was a good system of legislation then, why is it not now? That is for the Senators who are responsible for this legislation to answer. It seems to me that the reason for abandoning schedule-by-schedule revision is that certain leaders felt that if the tariff were revised in that way there were some schedules carrying certain provisions which they desired to pass that could not be passed. That was the reason, I believe, for grouping the schedules in former Congresses. They have been grouped together in order that one schedule might carry another through.

We felt that we were getting away from that system, which has been denounced with vehemence, as I have said, on both sides of this Chamber; but, no; the same policy, the same purpose to force into the law provisions and measures that could not be forced there without such a grouping of schedules has been thought desirable, and, therefore, they have been grouped.

Mr. JAMES. Will the Senator yield to me right there?

Mr. BRISTOW. Certainly.

Mr. JAMES. Of course, with 13 schedules in a tariff bill one schedule might be passed upon the theory that a certain amount of revenue would be produced by another schedule, but as matters went along the second schedule might be defeated entirely and the rates in the schedule first considered having been based upon the theory that the second schedule would be adopted there might be a large loss of revenue, and then you would have to go back and revise the first schedule. That is the trouble about revising the tariff schedule by schedule, as the Senator can very easily see.

As I understood the Senator, he said this bill was not perfect. Of course no tariff bill is ever perfect, but the question the Senator must answer when the roll call comes is whether or not this bill is a better bill, taking it as a whole, than the existing law. If it is, in my judgement, the Senator can not excuse himself to the satisfaction of the good people of Kansas by saying this is not a perfect bill. They are going to ask him Is it a better bill and less oppressive upon the people than the existing law? That is the issue the Senator from Kansas must meet.

Mr. BRISTOW. Mr. President, I deny the issue. That is not the question which I expect to answer. If the Senator wants an answer, however, I can give him my opinion. The pending bill is not any better than is the existing law. I voted against the Payne-Aldrich bill; I denounced it; I do not believe in it; but as excessive and as unreasonable as some of the duties in that bill were, it was a consistent measure, because it undertook to protect American industries, although in protecting them there were injected into the measure provisions which I believe to be iniquitous.

The pending bill protects some of the same industries, though not all of them to so great an extent. It sacrifices the agricultural interests of this country in a manner that has never been approached or undertaken in any tariff legislation of the past; and

because of its unjustifiable discriminations I have declared against this measure.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] has just handed me a memorandum, stating that the Walker tariff, which was praised so extravagantly by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] this morning as being the best of all tariff measures, the one now pending more nearly approaching it in excellence than any other, imposed duties of 20 per cent on barley, beef, corn and corn meal, flaxseed, hams and bacon, rye and rye flour, oats and oatmeal, wheat and wheat flour.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, and that bill was based upon the idea of protecting raw materials, the farmers' product, all the way up.

Mr. BRISTOW. I do not pretend to be a tariff expert; I have a very limited knowledge of the Walker bill, but I think the Walker bill—and in this I agree with the Senator from North Carolina—was a much better bill than the pending one. It was certainly drawn upon a much more justifiable principle.

As to the schedule-by-schedule theory of revising the tariff, I realize the force of the argument the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. JAMES] has made. I have heard it before; it is the usual argument to sustain the old system; it is the argument which has been made for combining all the schedules into one bill. That policy, however, was abandoned last year by the House of Representatives; and the Senator from Kentucky was then a Member of that body and a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee that prepared the schedule-by-schedule tariff bills. I presume he believed then that a schedule-by-schedule revision to be a better system. Under that plan each schedule would stand upon its own merits. Why has he changed his views this year?

The argument as to the effect a reduction or an increase in the duties imposed by one schedule might have upon the revenues would be a potent and powerful argument to me in behalf of a bill which the committee would report on any one schedule. That is true, and I believe it would be given full weight by the Senate or by the Congress.

The objection to the old system, as I have said, was that it enabled those interested to force into a tariff bill duties that ought not to be there, because Senators or Members of the House would not vote against a measure having in it more provisions in which they believed than it had provisions in which they did not believe, and upon that theory the Democratic Congress has gone back to the old machine methods of tariff making.

I want to say to the Senator from Kentucky and to the Senator from North Carolina that if Senators on this floor would vote their convictions and use their own judgment upon the items of this bill, it would not pass; and, failing to pass, the tariff would then be revised, and revised at this session in harmony with the best judgment of the Congress, upon whom the responsibility of revising it depends. No Senator can excuse himself for voting for a measure he believes to be wrong because it is alleged that that is the best he can get. It is not the best we can get if every Senator will follow his conscience and his convictions independent of party caucuses and partisan influences that swerve him from what he believes to be his line of duty. So far as I am concerned, I propose to vote for the paragraphs in this bill which I believe are right and against those which I believe to be wrong; and when the bill is finally made up, if I do not believe it to be a just measure, I intend to vote against it.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. Bristow] has made a great speech, and, to the general delight of all, has finally concluded it. Unless there is some other Senator who feels that he ought to deliver himself of some burden of concealed wisdom, and that that is of more importance than the winding up of this business, I should like now to proceed with the consideration of the immediate matter before the Senate.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, I should like to take a short time before consent is given to proceed, as requested by the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. STONE. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. President, a short time ago the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] called as a witness the Boston Journal, and, if his other statements were not more accurate than the ones which he casually made about the Boston Journal, they should at least be revised. I do not think it is of great importance whether the Boston Journal is 20 years old or 50 years old; but it is more than 50 years old, to my certain knowledge. Evidently the Boston Journal was called as a witness because the Senator from Montana supposed it to be an independent paper owned by Mr. Frank A. Munsey.

As a matter of fact, it is not owned by Mr. Munsey at all. So far as the public knows it is owned by Mr. Matthew Hale, who is chairman of the Progressive State committee, and it is the

organ of the Progressive Party in New England. So it is neither Mr. Munsey's paper nor an independent paper.

The article which was quoted was not signed, and therefore it is impossible to say whether it was written by a tariff expert or by some one who does not know the difference between a wool top and a spinning top. I suspect the latter, but I do not think it should be given any great weight in this debate. I think the Boston Journal has leanings toward the protective policy, and, as such, it deserves credit; but its owners would not claim for it expert standing on this subject; therefore I do not think the article quoted is entitled to any particular weight by the Senate.

The Senator from Montana referred once more and in practically the same language, and using the same facts which have been known to the public for the past 16 years, to the relations between Mr. Whitman, of the Arlington Mills, and Mr. North. I did not note anything new in the quotations which he used, but they were evidently made to prejudice opinion on the particular topic which is now being considered.

It is true that Mr. Whitman is largely interested in the Arlington Mills, that he did construct the first mill for the manufacture of tops in this country, and that he has been an active advocate of the protective tariff for a great many years. He has appeared before the committees of Congress at different times. He appeared before the subcommittee having in charge this particular schedule, I am told, and I have no doubt he made an illuminating and informing statement to that committee on the matter in which he was interested; but the statement made by the Senator from Montana that the Arlington Mills and the American Woolen Co. are substantially the only manufacturers of tops in this country is very far from correct. It is true they are large manufacturers of tops, but the American Woolen Co. has, I am informed, at times been a large purchaser of tops, and there are a great many manufacturing concerns in the United States which manufacture their own tops as well as yarns and cloths. There are also many—I do not recall the number—engaged entirely in manufacturing tops.

Incidentally this industry is in the poorest condition it has been during the last 25 years. The woolen industry, except in special cases, has never been a particularly profitable one in the United States; and the stock of the Arlington Mills, to which the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] has referred, is now selling at the lowest price it has sold for many years. Incidentally it has recently reduced its dividend one-half, a statement which usually brings joy to the hearts of the Democrats. I would rather see it prosperous, whoever owns it or whoever controls it, because if it is prosperous those who are connected with it are sure to be so, not only the owners of the mills but the employees.

I have not taken any time in the discussion of this particular schedule. It has been pretty fully discussed by other Senators who have given much time and consideration to it. I am well aware that the business men of this country, knowing that the Senate is in the hands of the Philistines, and that we are not going to get in the end any different results than have been reported, are desirous of having this bill passed. As far as I am concerned I should be glad, as soon as reasonable statements can be made of the reasons why particular schedules should not be adopted as they have been proposed, to have a vote on all schedules and on the bill—the sooner the better, in my judgment, from the standpoint of the Senate and the standpoint of the country at large. But I do not wish by my silence to have it inferred that I am in any way in approval of the rates proposed in this particular schedule.

Massachusetts is very largely interested in the woolen and worsted industry. Boston is the great wool center of the United States. Massachusetts is the leading State in the manufacture of woolen and worsted goods. A large percentage of our people are vitally interested in it. In my judgment this is the industry which is going to be most immediately and seriously affected by the passage of this bill. As I have just said, the woolen and worsted business is not in a very prosperous condition at best, and it has not been during the last 10 years, when duties have been high, as everyone knows. Just now, and indeed for the last several months, this business has been prostrated to a degree not known since 1895. I doubt if there are many woolen or worsted mills in this country that are running more than half time to-day; and no mill can make a profit running at one-half of its capacity.

I am opposed to every feature of this schedule—as opposed to putting wool on the free list as I am to other parts of it. I think putting wool on the free list is entirely without justification. The world's production of wool does not vary greatly. It has not increased materially in this country, if at all, during the past 10 years, when the duty has been very high. If there is to be increased production anywhere, it is going to be in other countries, where lands are cheaper than they are in this

country. Putting wool on the free list is going necessarily, in my judgment, to reduce somewhat the production in this country, if not largely so; and it is going to increase the production, if there is an increase, in other countries. Therefore we are throwing away the revenue which we have been getting from the importations of wool without any compensating benefit to the users of woolen goods in any form, unless the total production is largely increased, which I doubt.

There is a large amount of capital invested in the wool business which will be affected by the proposed change. The raisers of wool are entitled to reasonable protection, and the proposed action will, in effect, put a bounty on foreign wool and result in the importation of tops instead of wool.

But even if wool is put on the free list, I believe the other duties have not been arranged in such a way as to produce the results to which manufacturers are entitled. The question of tops has been very fully debated to-day or will be later. I think there is too great proneness for those who believe in a higher rate to take one class of tops as an example, and those who believe in the proposed rate to take a lower class of tops for their example. But I doubt if there is a manufacturer of tops in the United States who will claim, or any evidence can be submitted here to show, that the average top can be produced at the rate proposed in this bill. I have no doubt that the average is very much higher, and certainly the average cost in Great Britain is higher than the rate proposed by the bill. But even if the top rate were satisfactory, no provision has been made to provide for rovings, which are the next step in the production of cloths. The cost of producing rovings adds at least 50 per cent to the cost of producing tops, and rovings should be limited in the number of yarns in them, so that there may be a differentiation between rovings and yarns.

There is no way of telling, as this bill is framed, whether a certain product is a roving or a yarn. The result is that they go from the top stage, through rovings, of which there are 6 or 8 different numbers, up to the yarn stage, of which there are some 20 numbers, with exactly the same rate of duty on tops and on rovings, and possibly going over into the yarn numbers; then it is proposed to put a duty of 15 per cent on yarns.

There should be in framing the bill a differentiation between tops and rovings and between rovings and yarns, and when it comes to yarns there should be a variation in the rate of duty imposed on coarse yarns and fine yarns. The Bradford commission price for producing yarns varies greatly, because the cost of producing yarns of a very fine quality is materially greater than the cost of producing coarse yarns.

From all these standpoints I believe this schedule should be revised. I believe there should be a duty on wool. I believe the rate on tops should be increased; that there should be a distinct and separate rate on rovings; that there should be an increased and equalized rate on yarns. Even admitting that wool should be put on the free list, these intermediate changes should be made by the framers of the bill.

I have taken all the time I propose to take at this time, and I have simply taken this to voice what I believe is substantially the unanimous sentiment of the people of Massachusetts, and this applies to dealers in wool, to manufacturers of tops, rovings, yarns, and cloth alike. Without exception, as far as I know, they believe that the rates in this schedule are inadequate, and that they are so framed that they will produce great inequalities.

Mr. STONE. Mr. President, I ask that we may have a vote on the committee amendment in paragraph 295.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STONE. I understood that the committee amendment in paragraph 296 had been agreed to; but in order that there may be no question about it, I ask that it may now be submitted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is upon agreeing to the committee amendment in paragraph 296.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STONE. That concludes the wool schedule.

Mr. SMOOT. That concludes it, with the understanding that if the Senator from Wyoming desires to speak upon paragraph 296 he may do so.

Mr. STONE. I will say that the Senator from Wyoming asked that paragraphs 295 and 296 might both go over, so that if he desires to do so he may speak upon the two together.

Mr. SMOOT. And the remarks he will make will cover the two.

Mr. STONE. Yes. I should like, before we take up the next schedule, to revert to paragraph 324 of the silk schedule and to offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 324, page 95, line 23, before the word "beltings," it is proposed to insert "belts."

The amendment was agreed to.

The SECRETARY. Also, on page 96, line 3, after the word "manner," it is proposed to insert "and not specially provided for in this section."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, the next schedule is the one relating to papers and books. The one following that deals with sundries. Those two schedules and the free list are the only schedules left undisposed of.

The chairman of the subcommittee having in charge Schedule M and Schedule N is detained from the Senate on account of sickness in his family. I ask that those two schedules may be passed over, and that the Senate may now take up the free list, beginning on page 123.

Mr. LODGE. Do I understand the Senator is going to pass over the paper schedule?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. The Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], who is the chairman of the subcommittee, and who has given great study to that subject, is not in the Chamber to-day on account of illness in his family. I should not like to take up the schedule in his absence. Of course if there is an insistence about it we will do it, but I should much prefer to take up the free list.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. If any Senator who desires some item in the free list passed over happens to be absent or is not ready we will consent to its going over.

Mr. LODGE. Is the Senator going to pass over the sundries schedule also?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes. The Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON] is also chairman of that subcommittee. There are only three schedules left now—sundries, papers and books, and the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. I am quite positive there are some Senators who desire to speak upon some of the items in the free list who had no idea it would be reached to-day. If I knew the particular paragraphs in which they were interested I would ask that they might go over, but I am not informed as to which those paragraphs are.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think there will be no difficulty about it. If any Senator should come in and state that he was absent and should want to discuss a paragraph that we had passed, we would return to it without any objection on this side.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, there is one article in the free list which I do not suppose we shall reach, even if we begin on the free list at this moment, but which is also involved in the third paragraph of the paper schedule. It involves a question not of rates but of the countervailing duties in regard to the exportation of wood and wood pulp from Canada.

Mr. SIMMONS. When that is reached, if the Senator desires, we will pass over it.

Mr. LODGE. I shall be very glad to discuss it, if the Senator is willing. I am ready to go on with it. I supposed we should take up paper this afternoon.

Mr. SIMMONS. I should very much prefer that the Senator from Maine should be here when that is discussed.

Mr. LODGE. I will wait, of course, for the Senator from Maine, if that is the desire. There are some items in the free list which I should like to discuss. Of course I had no idea that that would come before the sundries and the paper schedule, and I have not my papers here, so that there are some things I shall have to ask to have passed over for myself. I do not know how it is with other Senators.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I desire to say that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] expected to offer his proposed substitute for Schedule K before its consideration was completed in the Committee of the Whole. He had no idea that we would get through with the schedule to-day. So if the Senator is back on Monday or Tuesday, before the bill gets into the Senate, no doubt the Senator having the bill in charge will allow him to offer his substitute then.

Mr. SIMMONS. Of course, if at some time before the Senate gets through with the bill the Senator from Pennsylvania desires to offer a substitute, there can be no objection to that course.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wanted to have that understood, because the Senator from Pennsylvania was compelled to leave the city to-day.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then I ask that the Secretary may read the bill, beginning with the free list, on page 123.

The reading of the bill was resumed, beginning under the heading "Free list," on page 123, line 21.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 401, page 124, line 11, after the word "machines," to strike out the word "and"; and in the same line, after the

word "gins," to insert "beet and sugar-cane machinery," so as to make the paragraph read:

401. Agricultural implements: Plows, tooth and disk harrows, headers, harvesters, reapers, agricultural drills and planters, mowers, horse-rakes, cultivators, thrashing machines, cotton gins, beet and sugar-cane machinery, wagons and carts, and all other agricultural implements of any kind and description, whether specifically mentioned herein or not, whether in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 402, page 124, line 16, after the word "and," to insert "all," and in the same line, after the word "albumen," to strike out the comma, so as to make the paragraph read:

402. Albumen, blood, and all albumen not specially provided for in this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 124, line 19, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

403½. Alizarin, natural or synthetic, and colors obtained from alizarin, anthracene, and carbazol.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that paragraph may be passed over.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 403½ will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 404, page 124, line 21, after the words "sulphate of," to insert "perchlorate of," so as to make the paragraph read:

404. Ammonia, sulphate of, perchlorate of, and nitrate of.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 144, line 22, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

404½. Antimony ore, stibnite and matte containing antimony, but only as to the antimony content.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, when the paragraph of Schedule C relating to antimony was before the Senate the suggestion was made by the Senator from Utah that antimony matte would be included instead of excluded from that section. I have since examined into the matter, and I am convinced that the Senator is right. So this paragraph will be taken back by the committee and we probably shall make a change in it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 404½ will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 405, page 125, line 23, after the word "horses," to strike out "asses, cattle"; in the same line, after the word "mules," to strike out "sheep, swine, and goats" and insert "and asses," so as to read:

Horses, mules, and asses straying across the boundary line into any foreign country, or driven across such boundary line by the owner for temporary pasturage purposes only, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 412, page 127, line 10, after the word "means," to insert "steel boxes," and, in the same paragraph, page 128, line 10, after the word "repairs," to insert "at the rate at which the article itself would be subject if imported," so as to make the paragraph read:

412. Articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, when returned after having been exported, without having been advanced in value or improved in condition by any process of manufacture or other means; steel boxes, casks, barrels, carboys, bags, and other containers or coverings of American manufacture exported filled with American products, or exported empty and returned filled with foreign products, including shooks and staves when returned as barrels or boxes; also quicksilver flasks or bottles, iron or steel drums of either domestic or foreign manufacture, used for the shipment of acids, or other chemicals, which shall have been actually exported from the United States; but proof of the identity of such articles shall be made under general regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, but the exemption of bags from duty shall apply only to such domestic bags as may be imported by the exporter thereof, and if any such articles are subject to internal-revenue tax at the time of exportation, such tax shall be proved to have been paid before exportation and not refunded; photographic dry plates or films of American manufacture (except moving-picture films), exposed abroad, whether developed or not, and films from moving-picture machines, light struck or otherwise damaged, or worn out, so as to be unsuitable for any other purpose than the recovery of the constituent materials, provided the basic films are of American manufacture, but proof of the identity of such articles shall be made under general regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury; articles exported from the United States for repairs may be returned upon payment of a duty upon the value of the repairs at the rate at which the article itself would be subject if imported under conditions and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided*, That this paragraph shall not apply to any article upon which an allowance of drawback has been made, the reimportation of which is hereby prohibited except upon payment of duties equal to the drawbacks allowed; or to any article manufactured in bonded warehouse and exported under any provision of law: *And provided further*, That when manufactured tobacco which has been ex-

ported without payment of internal-revenue tax shall be reimported it shall be retained in the custody of the collector of customs until internal-revenue stamps in payment of the legal duties shall be placed thereon: *And provided further*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply to animals made dutiable under the provisions of paragraph 405.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read down to paragraph 416, on page 129.

Mr. LODGE. I ask that paragraph 416 may be passed over. My colleague [Mr. WEEKS] has left the Chamber, and I know he desires to be heard upon it. I do not wish to speak upon it myself.

Mr. SIMMONS. That is satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. May the Chair inquire of the Senator from Massachusetts whether there is any objection to agreeing to the committee amendment before the paragraph goes over?

Mr. SIMMONS. I should have asked that that paragraph go over if the Senator from Massachusetts had not done so, as the committee desires to consider somewhat further its own amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 416 will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed, and the Secretary read down to paragraph 423, on page 130.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that paragraph 423 may be passed over. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] requested that that be done.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 423 will be passed over.

Mr. NELSON. In reference to paragraph 423, I suggest to the Senators in charge of the bill that they strike out the 600-foot limitation and make it "700 feet to the pound," because there is a good deal of the better quality of manilla twine that runs that much to the pound.

Mr. THOMAS. I will state to the Senator that the paragraph went over upon the request of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. NELSON. Has the paragraph gone over? Very well. Before I sit down, then, I wish to suggest to the Senators on the other side who have charge of the bill that the limitation should be entirely removed; that binding twine ought to be free, whether it runs 600 or 700 or 800 feet to the pound. I am not sure but that some of it, the best quality of manilla twine, will run 750 feet to the pound; and I should be glad if the committee would make the proper amendment.

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Minnesota why it would not be advisable to strike out all of that paragraph after the word "twine," if the intention is to put all binding twine on the free list? I know that was the desire of the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. NELSON. I think it would be best to strike it all out—to strike out the limitation altogether. If you retain it, however, I suggest that it ought to be "not more than 750 feet to the pound."

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, the trouble with the suggestion of striking out the limitation is that twine might be imported as binding twine which could not be used for that purpose and would be used for other purposes. As this is intended to refer only to binding twine, there ought to be a limit on the size, and I think if it should be made 750 feet to the pound it would cover everything that could be called binding twine.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 130, after line 16, to insert a new section, as follows:

427j. Blankets, composed wholly or in chief value of wool, valued at less than 40 cents per pound.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will go over.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 430, page 130, line 25, after the word "use," to strike out the remainder of the paragraph, in the following words:

Press cloths, composed of camel's hair, imported expressly for oil-milling purposes and marked so as to indicate that it is for such purposes, and cut into lengths not to exceed 72 inches and woven in widths not under 10 inches nor to exceed 15 inches, and weighing not less than one-half pound per square foot.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 433, page 131, line 13, after the word "muster," to strike out "engravings"; in line 14, before the word "lithographic," to strike out "etchings"; in the same line, after the word "prints," to strike out "bound or"; in the same line, after the word "unbound," to strike out "and charts"; and in line 15, before the

word "which," to insert "or in bindings over 20 years old, and charts," so as to make the paragraph read:

433. Books, maps, music, photographs, lithographic prints, unbound or in bindings over 20 years old, and charts, which shall have been printed more than 20 years at the date of importation, and all hydrographic charts, and publications issued for their subscribers or exchanges by scientific and literary associations or academies, or publications of individuals for gratuitous private circulation, not advertising matter, and public documents issued by foreign governments.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I wish to discuss those committee amendments. I do not understand why engravings, etchings, and charts should be taken from the free list. It seems to me that those are objects of general interest, educational and artistic. I suppose they are put somewhere on the dutiable list. The paragraph of the free list now reads:

Books, maps, music, photographs, lithographic prints, unbound or in bindings over 20 years old, and charts.

Mr. HUGHES. The change was merely one of phraseology, so far as charts are concerned.

Mr. LODGE. I see it was a change only in phraseology. Lithographic prints, to which I have no sort of objection, were added, but I do not see why engravings and etchings, which are far more valuable artistically than lithographic prints, should be taken from this clause. I hope that will not be done.

Mr. STONE. I suggest to the Senator that for the present, in the absence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. JOHNSON], we may pass over the paragraph.

Mr. LODGE. I am perfectly willing to let it go over, but I should like to call the Senator's attention to another point. The committee has added "or in bindings over 20 years old, and charts." I think the intention of that amendment is entirely proper. Books of great value are often sent abroad and bindings of great cost are put upon them. I think it would be just as well if the bindings were made here; but, anyway, I see no reason why they should not pay a revenue duty. But it is so worded as to leave a very serious ambiguity; that is, whether it is only the binding or whether it covers the book also. Take a case like this—I happened to take it from an English catalogue: A first folio Shakespeare worth \$20,000, of course free under our law, as it always has been, would come in free. If you put a binding on it, in the particular case I am referring to, worth \$15, I do not think it is perfectly clear that you would not tax that book at the value of \$20,000. That is not the intention of the framers of the paragraph, of course. Such has never been the intention. I think there is an ambiguity, which I wish the committee would look into if they are going to take the amendment back. I have not attempted to reword it.

Mr. STONE. It seems to me that books, maps, and so forth, unbound, or in bindings over 20 years old, would indicate that they had been printed more than 20 years.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator that that language was added in order to correct a practice. It has been the custom, I understand, to send books abroad and have them bound. The books have been printed in this country and they are rebound on the other side, and merely because they were printed more than 20 years ago they would be admitted free, whereas the object in putting them on the free list was to permit books more than 20 years old to come in free.

Mr. LODGE. Certainly; I understand that.

Mr. HUGHES. This discriminated very much against our bookbinders, and they complained about it.

Mr. LODGE. I will take that in conjunction with paragraph 337:

Books of all kinds, bound or unbound, not specially provided for, 15 per cent ad valorem.

That is limited in the case of the English language to books less than 20 years old.

Mr. THOMAS. I will say to the Senator from Massachusetts that paragraph 337 will probably be reported to the Senate in a different form.

Mr. HUGHES. In any event the Senator will notice that if that language stays as it is, it would provide that books of all kinds, bound or unbound, not specially provided for, would have 15 per cent ad valorem. This applies only to books with bindings of a certain age.

Mr. LODGE. No; the way you have it worded it applies to bindings over 20 years old.

Mr. HUGHES. But if they are in bindings over 20 years old they must have been printed more than 20 years.

Mr. LODGE. That brings me just to the point. If the binding is over 20 years old it does not follow that the book is over 20 years old. Very frequently an old binding is purchased and placed by book fanciers on a book; in order to have the binding in the same period as the book when written.

Old print bindings command an immense price, and very often they are taken off the book to which they belong and applied to some book of great value. It does not necessarily follow that that is an exception to paragraph 337. Of course, the purpose of these clauses always has been to limit the books that had to bear a duty to books printed in the English language and that were less than 20 years old. That was the dutiable class.

Mr. HUGHES. Then it was found that books were collected in this country and sent abroad to be cheaply bound and brought in free of duty.

Mr. LODGE. I am entirely in sympathy with the purposes of the amendment, as I said in the beginning, putting a duty on new bindings, but I am afraid the way it is worded leaves great ambiguity.

Mr. HUGHES. The paragraph will go over.

Mr. LODGE. I hope those paragraphs will be amended by the committee so as to make it clear that the object is to place the duty on binding that is less than 20 years old. The paragraph is going back. I only desired to call the attention of the committee to it and to express the hope that they will consider those two paragraphs in conjunction.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 434, page 131, line 22, after the word "Books," to strike out "and pamphlets printed chiefly in languages other than English; also books," and in line 24, after the word "blind," to insert "and all textbooks used in schools and other educational institutions; Braille tablets, cubarithmes, special apparatus and objects serving to teach the blind, including printing apparatus, machines, presses, and types for the use and benefit of the blind exclusively," so as to make the paragraph read:

434. Books and music, in raised print, used exclusively by the blind, and all textbooks used in schools and other educational institutions; Braille tablets, cubarithmes, special apparatus and objects serving to teach the blind, including printing apparatus, machines, presses, and types for the use and benefit of the blind exclusively.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I trust the Senator in charge of this paragraph will let it be passed over. The amendment reported by the committee, I think, ought to be modified. I should like to have it passed over in order that the committee may give it further consideration.

Mr. LODGE. There will be a good deal of debate on paragraph 434.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 434 goes over. Paragraph 433 has also gone over.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 435, page 132, line 7, after the word "use," to strike out "and" and insert "or"; and, in line 11, after the word "use," to strike out "and" and insert "or," so as to make the paragraph read:

435. Books, maps, music, engravings, photographs, etchings, lithographic prints, and charts, specially imported, not more than two copies in any one invoice, in good faith, for the use or by order of any society or institution incorporated or established solely for religious, philosophical, educational, scientific, or literary purposes, or for the encouragement of the fine arts, or for the use or by order of any college, academy, school, or seminary of learning in the United States, or any State or public library, and not for sale, subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 132, to strike out paragraph 438, in the following words:

438. Bran and wheat screenings.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that that paragraph may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 438 goes over.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wish merely to call the attention of the Senator from North Dakota to the fact that paragraph 438 was stricken out because the items there are included in the subsequent paragraph relating to wheat and wheat flour and the products of wheat.

Mr. McCUMBER. I presume that is true; but I want to look into it, if the Senator has no objection.

Mr. THOMAS. Very well.

The Secretary continued the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 450, page 133, line 15, after the word "separators," to insert "sand-blast machines, sludge machines," so as to make the paragraph read:

450. Cash registers, linotype and all typesetting machines, sewing machines, typewriters, shoe machinery, cream separators, sand-blast machines, sludge machines, and tar and oil spreading machines used in the construction and maintenance of roads and in improving them by the use of road preservatives, all the foregoing whether imported in whole or in parts, including repair parts.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to have paragraph 450 passed over for the present.

Mr. SIMMONS. Does the Senator object to action upon the committee amendment to that paragraph?

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to be heard on only one item of the paragraph. After it has been passed over it can be taken up for consideration at any time. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is not here.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask that the committee amendment to that paragraph be acted on now.

Mr. SMOOT. But not that the paragraph be finally passed upon.

Mr. SIMMONS. Not finally passing upon the part which the Senator wishes to discuss.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LODGE. Now it is to be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee was, on page 133, after line 19, to insert as a new paragraph:

450½. Cast-iron pipe of every description.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 450½ goes over.

Mr. SIMMONS. Did we not discuss that very elaborately and take a vote upon it?

Mr. SMOOT. Not upon the wording of this paragraph, "cast-iron pipe of every description." The junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLIVER] is not here, and I think he desires to submit a few remarks on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 450½ will be passed over.

The next amendment of the committee was, in paragraph 452, page 133, line 22, after the word "Catgut," to insert "for surgical use, and," so as to make the paragraph read:

452. Catgut, for surgical use, and whip gut, or worm gut, unmanufactured.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 133, after line 23, to insert as a new paragraph the following:

452½. Cement, Roman, Portland, and other hydraulic.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 460, page 134, line 14, after the word "tar," to insert "dead or creosote oil," and in line 15, after the word "as," to insert "anthracene and anthracene oil," so as to make the paragraph read:

460. Coal tar, crude, pitch of coal tar, wood or other tar, dead or creosote oil, and products of coal tar known as anthracene and anthracene oil, naphthalin, phenol, and cresol.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 135, line 10, to strike out paragraph 471, in the following words:

471. Coral, marine, uncut, and unmanufactured.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 476, page 135, line 16, after the word "kryolith," to insert "natural," so as to make the paragraph read:

476. Cryolite, or kryolith, natural.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that paragraph go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 476 goes over with the amendment agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 135, after line 22, to insert as a new paragraph:

481½. Glaziers' and engravers' diamonds, unset, miners' diamonds, and diamond dust.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 485, page 136, line 15, before the word "birds," to insert the word "fowls," so as to make the paragraph read:

485. Eggs of fowls, birds, fish, and insects (except fish roe preserved for food purposes): *Provided, however,* That the importation of eggs of game birds or eggs of birds not used for food, except specimens for scientific collections, is prohibited: *Provided further,* That the importation of eggs of game birds for purposes of propagation is hereby authorized, under rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I presume the word "fowls" is to be inserted there in order to make sure that eggs of poultry are put on the free list. Of course the hen is a bird, but the word "poultry" seems more natural.

Mr. WILLIAMS. What was the question?

Mr. LODGE. I was asking about the insertion of the word "fowls." I suppose it was done to make sure that the eggs of poultry were placed on the free list.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think that is right.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask to recur to paragraph 416 for a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state that the paragraph has gone over by agreement.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that; but I want to offer an amendment to perfect it, and I thought then it could go over as perfected. Of course it will have to be recurred to by unanimous consent, if at all, because it was passed over in that way. I desire to move to amend the committee amendment by striking out the words "nor in any manner loaded so as to increase the weight per yard."

I have consulted with members of the committee, and we think we have made a mistake in the insertion of that language. So I desire to move to strike it out.

Mr. LODGE. I do not rise to object to the amendment, but that whole paragraph was passed over, and I think the amendment had better be reserved until we again take it up. We did nothing with that paragraph at all, but passed it over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I thought I had obtained unanimous consent to recur to it, for the purpose of perfecting it. If I have not obtained unanimous consent, of course, I will not proceed. I understood the presiding officer to put the question to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question was not put; but there was no objection made.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is what I understood. Did the Chair ask if there was objection?

Mr. LODGE. It was agreed by unanimous consent to pass the paragraph over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood that; but I then asked unanimous consent to recur to it, for the purpose of perfecting the committee amendment, so that when it is passed over it is passed over as we want it to be, and not as we do not want it to be.

Mr. LODGE. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Then, I move to strike out the words "nor in any manner loaded so as to increase the weight per yard."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In paragraph 416, page 129, line 13, after the word "process," it is proposed to amend the amendment of the committee by striking out the words "nor in any manner loaded so as to increase the weight per yard."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph now goes over.

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senator in charge of this portion of the bill to the fact that if paragraph 471, on page 135, is stricken out without providing a substitute paragraph, the sequence in the numbers will be broken.

Mr. LODGE. That is a matter that can be attended to in conference.

Mr. McLEAN. It can easily be remedied by advancing the numbers of the succeeding paragraphs until we get to paragraph 481.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 486, page 136, line 23, after the word "corundum," to insert "and crude artificial abrasives, not specially provided for," so as to make the paragraph read:

486. Emery ore and corundum, and crude artificial abrasives, not specially provided for.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that that paragraph may be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 492, page 137, line 10, after the words "Flax straw," to insert "flax, not hackled or dressed; flax hackled, known as 'dressed line,' tow of flax and flax noils; hemp, and tow of hemp; hemp hackled, known as 'line of hemp,' so as to make the paragraph read:

492. Flax straw, flax, not hackled or dressed; flax hackled, known as "dressed line," tow of flax and flax noils; hemp, and tow of hemp; hemp hackled, known as "line of hemp."

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that paragraph 492 be passed over.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask the Senator if he would have any objection to discussing it this afternoon?

Mr. McCUMBER. I wish to offer an amendment to the paragraph, which I can not draw at this time. I do not desire to

discuss the duty on flax, I will say to the Senator, any further than I have done.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over. The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 137, after line 19, to insert a new paragraph as follows:

496. Fulminates, fulminating powder, and other like articles not specially provided for in this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 137, after line 21, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

496. Furs and fur skins, undressed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 137, after line 23, to strike out paragraph 498, as follows:

498. Glass enamel, white, for watch and clock dials.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I should like to ask why glass enamel used in the manufacture of watch and clock dials, on which there has been a very heavy reduction of duty, has been stricken from the free list and put on the dutiable list? Perhaps it is not put on the dutiable list; I have not been all through the free list, but I understand that it is on the dutiable list. The committee withdrew the watch paragraph.

Mr. HUGHES. This item has been put in Schedule B. The reason it was stricken from the free list was because of the difficulty in the administration of the law and because of the conflict with the other paragraph in Schedule B.

Mr. LODGE. Glass enamel used for watch and clock dials is on the free list now, and, as I have said, the duty on watches and clocks has been immensely reduced. It seems to me, inasmuch as the watch paragraph has been withdrawn the enamel paragraph ought to be taken into consideration by the committee in connection with perfecting the watch paragraph, which, as I have said and as the Senator is aware, has been withdrawn.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will find that it falls now in paragraph 98.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; paragraph 98.

Mr. SMOOT. An amendment was reported and agreed to adding glass enamel to the fusible enamel covered by that paragraph, so that it will carry a duty of 20 per cent.

Mr. LODGE. It will carry a duty of 20 per cent.

Mr. HUGHES. That has been adopted and is not in controversy, as I understand. The watch paragraph was taken back not for that reason, and this amendment was reported. I will say to the Senator, because, as I have said, it was found impossible to permit this glass enamel for watch dials to come in free without throwing the door open for all glass enamel. That is the difficulty.

Mr. LODGE. It has been done for a good many years without letting in all glass enamel.

Mr. HUGHES. It did let in all glass enamel.

Mr. LODGE. It does seem to me that it ought to be taken into consideration with the watch paragraph; and I will ask that the paragraph be passed over for the present, until the watch paragraph is taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 498 will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 505, page 138, line 24, after the word "Gum," to insert "Amber in chips valued at not more than 50 cents per pound," so as to make the paragraph read:

505. Gum: Amber in chips valued at not more than 50 cents per pound, copal, damar, and kauri.

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the paragraph go over, in order that I may have an opportunity to offer an amendment to it, not for any discussion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no objection, as the Chair understands, to the committee amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 139, beginning in line 1, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

505. Gunpowder, and all explosive substances, not specially provided for in this section, used for mining, blasting, and artillery purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 518, page 140, line 2, after the word "water," to insert "and colors obtained from indigo," so as to make the paragraph read:

518. Indigo, natural or synthetic, dry or suspended in water, and colors obtained from indigo.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that paragraph be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 518 will be passed over.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I do not suppose the Senator has any objection to action upon the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. The reason I asked that the paragraph go over is that I want to call the attention of the Senate to the words "and colors obtained from indigo."

Mr. SIMMONS. Then the Senator is objecting to the committee amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the amendment to which I am objecting, because I do not believe that the committee has really gone into the subject sufficiently to realize where that wording will lead.

Mr. SIMMONS. Very well; it is satisfactory that the paragraph go over.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We will be glad to have the Senator indicate his objection, so that we may consider it.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection whatever to indigo going on the free list. The only objection I have is to the amendment inserting the words "and colors obtained from indigo," because that language will conflict with the provision affecting other colors now on the dutiable list, and I can not see how the provision is going to be administered.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Can the Senator indicate some of the colors?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, there are a good many of the coal-tar dyes which are derivatives of indigo.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Does not the paragraph imposing a duty on coal-tar dyes provide for an exception where they are otherwise specially provided for? The purpose of the committee was to put these derivatives on the free list.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the trouble. One paragraph imposes a duty on the article not otherwise specially provided for and the other provides that it shall be free. I am not objecting, as I have said, to indigo going on the free list, for that is proper and right; but the wording of the amendment is going to result in a conflict.

Mr. STONE. Let the paragraph be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The paragraph will be passed over. The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, in paragraph 522, page 140, line 9, after the word "pyrites," to insert "iron in pigs, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, wrought iron and scrap and scrap steel; but nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except secondhand or waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be remanufactured; ferromanganese; iron in slabs, blooms, loops or other forms less finished than iron bars, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings, not specially provided for in this section," so as to make the paragraph read:

522. Iron ore, including manganiferous iron ore, and the dross or residuum from burnt pyrites; iron in pigs, iron kentledge, spiegeleisen, wrought iron and scrap and scrap steel; but nothing shall be deemed scrap iron or scrap steel except secondhand or waste or refuse iron or steel fit only to be remanufactured; ferromanganese; iron in slabs, blooms, loops or other forms less finished than iron bars, and more advanced than pig iron, except castings, not specially provided for in this section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 532, page 141, line 1, after the word "Lard," to insert "lard compounds, and lard substitutes," so as to make the paragraph read:

532. Lard, lard compounds, and lard substitutes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 534, page 141, line 3, after the numerals "534," to strike out "All leather not specially provided for in this section and leather board or compressed leather; leather cut into shoe uppers or vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into boots or shoes" and to insert "Sole leather, leather board or compressed leather, grain, buff, and split leather, all dressed upper leather, including patent, japanned, varnished, or enameled upper leather and shoe-lining leather, all of the foregoing for boot and shoe manufacturing purposes; leather cut into vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into boots or shoes; belting, harness and saddle leather, leather waste, skins for morocco, rough leather, tanned but not finished"; in line 16, after the word "or," to insert "in"; and in line 17, after the word "unfinished," to strike out "composed wholly or in chief value of leather," so as to make the paragraph read:

534. Sole leather, leather board or compressed leather, grain, buff, and split leather, all dressed upper leather, including patent, japanned, varnished, or enameled upper leather and shoe-lining leather, all of the

foregoing for boot and shoe manufacturing purposes; leather cut into vamps or other forms suitable for conversion into boots or shoes; belting, harness and saddle leather, leather waste, skins for morocco, rough leather, tanned but not finished; boots and shoes made wholly or in chief value of leather; leather shoe-laces, finished or unfinished; harness, saddles, and saddlery, in sets or in parts, finished or unfinished.

Mr. WEEKS and Mr. PAGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WEEKS. I should like to have that paragraph go over.

Mr. STONE. Which paragraph?

Mr. WEEKS. Paragraph 534.

Mr. PAGE. I was about to ask the same favor, Mr. President.

Mr. GALLINGER. Before that paragraph goes over, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill whether or not the paragraph on page 117, paragraph 376, which has been stricken out, has been included in this paragraph 534, on page 141? Is paragraph 534 intended to include that, or does some other provision cover it?

Mr. SMOOT. It is in paragraph 534.

Mr. GALLINGER. It is not worded in the same way.

Mr. THOMAS. That is included in the phraseology of the amendment to paragraph 534. I will call the Senator's attention to line 12, page 141.

Mr. GALLINGER. I observe it is included, and I hope the paragraph will go over, because it ought to be very seriously considered.

Mr. THOMAS. It goes over, as I understand, by request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Paragraph 534 will be passed over.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Finance was, on page 141, after line 24, to insert a new paragraph, as follows:

537½. Limestone-rock asphalt; asphaltum, and bitumen.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 543, page 142, line 7, after the word "of," to insert "natural," so as to make the paragraph read:

543. Manganese, oxide and ore of, natural.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in paragraph 548, page 142, line 15, after the word "section," to insert:

Provided, That meat and meat products brought to the United States shall be subject to the same inspection by the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1906, for domestic cattle and meats, unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied that the government of the country whence the meat or meat products are exported maintains and enforces a system of inspection equal to our own, or satisfactory to him as being competent to protect the public health, in which case the certificate of such government that such inspection has been made shall be sufficient.

So as to make the paragraph read:

548. Meats: Fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork; bacon and hams; meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for in this section: *Provided*, That meat and meat products brought to the United States shall be subject to the same inspection by the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1906, for domestic cattle and meats, unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied that the government of the country whence the meat or meat products are exported maintains and enforces a system of inspection equal to our own, or satisfactory to him as being competent to protect the public health, in which case the certificate of such government that such inspection has been made shall be sufficient.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask that paragraph 548 may go over for the purpose of giving me an opportunity to prepare an amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, before it goes over, I think it only fair that I should present, probably not the same kind of amendment in the mind of the Senator from North Dakota, but one which was printed a long time ago and was referred to the Committee on Finance. It relates to the proviso that has been offered by the committee. I ask the Secretary to read it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out the proviso offered by the committee, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

Provided, however, That none of the foregoing meats shall be imported into the United States from any foreign country unless and until the President, after due investigation, has found and proclaimed that the Government of any such foreign country has established and is maintaining a system of meat inspection which is the substantial equivalent and is as efficient as the system established and maintained by the laws of the United States in the Department of Agriculture; and especially that the system of such foreign country provides for the examination of all cattle, sheep, swine, and goats before they are allowed to enter into any slaughtering, packing, meat canning, rendering, or similar establishment in which they are to be slaughtered and the meat or meat products thereof are to be used for food: *And provided further*, That no meat imported into the United States from any foreign country shall be sold in the United States until it is examined and inspected, after arrival and before sale, by inspectors appointed by the Secretary of Agriculture; and the provisions of an act making

appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, relating to post-mortem examinations and inspections of the carcasses and parts thereof of cattle, sheep, swine, and goats are hereby made applicable to carcasses, parts thereof, and meats so imported into the United States from any such foreign country.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, if the amendment the Senator from North Dakota has in mind does not relate to meat inspection, I shall be very glad to submit my views with regard to the subject now, and have this part of it acted upon. It is more convenient for me to do it now than it may be when the paragraph is again reached.

Mr. McCUMBER. I will reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Iowa that the amendment I had in mind was one which would make this section similar to the section which provides for the free importation of wheat, namely, providing for a duty against the meats of any country equivalent to the duty levied by that country upon American meats, and it has no reference whatever to the matter of inspection.

Mr. CUMMINS. I believe that meat ought not to be upon the free list, but if free, should be under the conditions suggested by the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I should be very glad, indeed, to hear the Senator this afternoon, if it is more convenient for him to address himself to this paragraph at this time than it would be at a later period; but I shall ask to have the paragraph passed over with a view to offering something upon the paragraph later. I shall be very glad, however, to defer that request until after the Senator has spoken.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well. As there seems to be a desire to have it go over, if I am not here when the amendment is reached, I desire to have it voted upon without any argument on my part.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not think the Senator from Iowa quite understands the situation. I do not think there is any desire to have it go over. The desire is to have him deal with it now, as far as he can.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think there is. My idea was, if the amendment I have proposed does not interfere with the amendment suggested by the Senator from North Dakota, to have the inspection part of it disposed of to-night.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think we ought to do that.

Mr. CUMMINS. But I think the Senator from Wisconsin has it in mind, possibly, to consider that part of it.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; but I very cheerfully consented, so far as I was concerned, to the Senator proceeding this afternoon if it suits his convenience.

Mr. CUMMINS. But I would rather defer what I have to say than to debate the amendment now and have it voted upon at some other time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I understood the Senator to say that it might not be convenient for him to be here at all when it is taken up again.

Mr. CUMMINS. It may not be.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. In that event, of course, the Senate would miss the opportunity to hear the Senator's views upon this paragraph. I am sure all of us would be very glad to hear them.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not know whether it will be convenient or not. I know that I shall be necessarily absent for a day or two while the bill is under consideration. I shall hope to be here. But in order that Senators may know my reasons for the amendment I have offered, I shall very briefly call to their attention the scope of the amendment proposed by the committee and the scope of the amendment I have offered as a substitute for the committee amendment.

I do not believe meat should come into the United States unconditionally free; but if meat is to come to the United States to be consumed by the people of the United States, it seems to me we ought to have the same protection against foreign meat that we have provided against domestic meat. There can be no reason why we should allow the foreigner to supply us with diseased meat and exclude our own people from supplying us with the same kind of meat. It certainly can not have been in the mind of the committee to place upon the introduction of foreign meat into the United States a less rigorous condition than we have already attached to the introduction of domestic meat into the channels of interstate commerce.

If I show favor to one or the other, I intend to show it to our own people, although I am not contending that, so far as inspection is concerned, there should be any favor shown to either.

The purpose of my amendment is to put the foreigner on exactly the same footing that we have already arranged for the domestic manufacturer.

Now let us see. The amendment suggested by the committee reads in this way:

Provided, That meat and meat products brought to the United States shall be subject to the same inspection by the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1906, for domestic cattle and meats, unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied that the government of the country whence the meat or meat products are exported maintains and enforces a system of inspection equal to our own, or satisfactory to him as being competent to protect the public health, in which case the certificate of such government that such inspection has been made shall be sufficient.

The first thought that arises in one's mind when he is examining this language must be that, while we have established a system of ante-mortem examination and inspection with regard to our meat-manufacturing industries, we are about to allow foreign meats to enter our country without any ante-mortem examination unless it happens that the country from which they come has established such a system. I want the Senate to be perfectly clear upon that point, because I am sure the committee has made a mistake in the matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, if I understand the Senator, he wants the Government of the United States to make an ante-mortem examination of meats in the Argentine Republic and in Australia, and in Germany, and in France, and in Canada, and in all the balance of the world.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator from Mississippi is not so clear as he usually is, because I have not suggested anything of the kind, and of course I recognize the futility of suggesting anything of the kind.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I so understood him, because the Senator said that while we subjected our own cattle to an ante-mortem examination, we were not going to subject foreign cattle to that examination.

Mr. CUMMINS. Precisely; I did so say.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And the amendment which the committee has offered says that these cattle shall not be admitted free unless—

Mr. CUMMINS. These are not cattle. This is meat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I mean meat; that this meat, then, shall not be admitted free unless it has been subjected to an examination the same as or equal to that to which we subject our cattle—that is, subjected to this examination by the government of the country of export before it comes—or unless the Secretary of Agriculture thinks the system of examination to which the cattle and meat are subjected in their own country is sufficient to protect the public health.

That is the committee amendment, and there is no quarrel with it unless it be one of two things: Either that we ourselves should make an ante-mortem examination of the meat—of course you have to make it of cattle, because that is what an ante-mortem examination of meat necessarily is; it is cattle while living—or that there should be an examination of the viscera at the port of entry. I take it, however, that the Senator does not mean that there should be an examination of the viscera at the port or anything of that kind. He does not want that. That is the system Germany invokes.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am not establishing a system. I am simply taking the system we already have established in this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is precisely what the committee amendment does.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am sure the Senator from Mississippi is wrong with regard to it, and if he will review the amendment he will see that he is wrong. I will undertake now to analyze it a little further.

The paragraph, to be understood, must be read as a whole:

Meats: Fresh beef, veal, mutton, lamb, and pork; bacon and hams; meats of all kinds, prepared or preserved, not specially provided for in this section: *Provided, That meat and meat products brought to the United States—*

I pause there to say that of course they are brought here after the animals from which the products come are killed—shall be subject to the same inspection—

That is, the meats shall be subject to the same inspection—by the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1906, for domestic cattle and meats—

This is the requirement, then, that when the meats reach this country they shall be subjected to the same inspection that we require for our own meats, as provided in the law of 1906, although that law was reenacted at a later time and possibly changed a little. However, that is immaterial. But in this amendment the committee has provided simply for an inspection

of the meat after it reaches the United States; that is all. You have given the Secretary of Agriculture authority to waive that requirement in a certain contingency; and now I shall proceed to read further. This examination or inspection is to be made—unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied that the Government of the country whence the meat or meat products are exported maintains and enforces a system of inspection equal to our own, or satisfactory to him as being competent to protect the public health, in which case the certificate of such Government that such inspection has been made shall be sufficient.

Suppose the Secretary of Agriculture decides that the country from which the meat comes has no adequate system of inspection, what then? He then inspects the meat as it reaches the ports of the United States. If the meat passes the inspection it must be admitted into the United States, and there is no opportunity whatever to make an ante-mortem examination, nor could the authorities of this country require that an ante-mortem examination should be made.

If it were true that all the protection we need against impure meat can be given through a post-mortem inspection, I should have no complaint to make of the committee amendment. But we all know—I do not know it very well except from reading the literature upon the subject—that there are some diseases against which people can not be fully protected save by ante-mortem examination or inspection. Therefore in our country, before an animal can be slaughtered in any packing plant, it must be inspected alive; and if it fails to pass the inspection it is not permitted to be manufactured into food.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. LANE] questions that. I know what I am speaking of, because, fortunately, I have the regulations before me.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President, I was merely questioning this: I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that all animals brought into the stockyards are slaughtered on the same floor; and those which are diseased and unfit for human food, in the opinion of the inspector, are sent out to be used as fertilizer.

Mr. CUMMINS. Certainly.

Mr. LANE. The ante-mortem examination does not amount to so much. It is the post-mortem examination which is the more important, and decides whether or not the meat shall be used for human food.

Now I did not shake my head at the Senator to confuse him or dispute his statement. The other proposition is one just as strong as the contention which he makes. If there is no means of ascertaining what form of post-mortem examinations they make of a meat supply in a foreign country then you are in as great a danger as you are from the other contention, and it is equally urgent.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course if it were any ailment of the human body I would accept the view of the Senator from Oregon as conclusive, but inasmuch as this refers to another kind of animal I must differ from him with regard to the value of the ante-mortem inspection.

I repeat, Mr. President, there is no reason for making a favorite of the butcher in Argentina or the butcher in Canada. If we are to expose our own people to the free competition of the world, we certainly ought to care enough about the health and the welfare of our own people to take exactly the same precautions against diseased meat when the foreigner tries to feed us as when our own people try to feed us.

Mr. LANE. If the Senator will allow me just a moment more, I will state the point to which I wished to call his attention. I did not raise it to dispute or to embarrass the Senator in any way.

Mr. CUMMINS. The Senator does not embarrass me in the least.

Mr. LANE. Anyway I do not dispute the point the Senator is trying to make. The meat of the animal, as a rule, does not show the effect of disease. In diseased cattle unfit for human food a diseased condition manifests itself in the viscera. In a number of cases a steer or cow will look to be fat and well fed and upon an ante-mortem examination would be an ideal subject out of which to make beef, but on a post-mortem examination it is frequently found to be infected with tubercular tissue in the lungs and unfit for food.

Mr. CUMMINS. I have not questioned the latter statement. I think it requires both an ante-mortem and a post-mortem inspection in order to be sure that we have pure meat; and why in the world we require our own packers and butchers and our own farmers to submit to ante-mortem examination and do not require such an examination from the foreigner is more than I can understand. It is utterly impossible for me to conceive why this discrimination is made in favor of the importer of meat.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. This is a matter that greatly interests me. If I understand the Senator from Iowa, he is absolutely right in his contention. I would not interrupt the Senator, but would wait if I were not called out of the Chamber.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator's idea is that we should insist that every foreign country from which meat is sent to us shall have substantially the same ante-mortem examination that we have had.

Mr. CUMMINS. A simple reading of my amendment will indicate just what I desire, and my objection against substituting a mere inspection after slaughter and after the meat has traveled across the ocean in order to reach the American shore.

The amendment which I have proposed is:

That none of the foregoing meats shall be imported into the United States from any foreign country unless and until the President, after due investigation, has found and proclaimed that the Government of any such foreign country has established and is maintaining a system of meat inspection which is the substantial equivalent and is as efficient as the system established and maintained by the laws of the United States in the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. GALLINGER. It seems to me, Mr. President, that that amendment ought to be agreed to without objection, and we ought to insist that meat sent to us from abroad should be as carefully inspected as the meats that our own people produce.

Mr. CUMMINS. I supposed that it would be accepted. I did not dream that when it was known that this proposal of the committee allowed meats to come here subject only to post-mortem examination there would be objection to so strengthening the regulation as to require that the foreign country should maintain the same efficient system of inspection that we maintain for ourselves.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CUMMINS. I do.

Mr. LANE. I wish to say to the Senator that I agree with him in his desire and wish that every possible safeguard shall be thrown around it, and if this does not cover it I would be very glad to join with him in getting the best possible provision we can.

Mr. CUMMINS. I am very glad to hear the Senator from Oregon say that. I am attempting to show—and it can be shown so clearly that it is impossible to dispute it—that this does not require more than a post-mortem inspection, and that if meats were to come in from every part of the world, from countries that had no system of inspection, they would enter our market subject only to the post-mortem examination required by our law.

The chief difference between the amendment proposed by the committee and the amendment which I have proposed is that if the meat does not come from a country that has established a system of ante-mortem examination it can not enter our markets, and even after it does enter our markets then it is subject to the same post-mortem inspection that we have provided for our own meat. With regard to the post-mortem inspections I have no quarrel at all with the amendment proposed by the committee.

Mr. WILLIAMS rose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Does the Senator from Mississippi desire to interrupt me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. No; I desire to read the Senator's amendment and reply to the Senator when he gets through.

Mr. CUMMINS. Very well. I have but a few words more to say about it.

In the law of March 4, 1907, making appropriations for the Agricultural Department for the year ending June 30, 1908, there is found this provision:

For meat inspection: That hereafter, for the purpose of preventing the use in interstate or foreign commerce, as hereinafter provided, of meat and meat-food products which are unsound, unhealthful, unwholesome, or otherwise unfit for human food, the Secretary of Agriculture, at his discretion, may cause to be made, by inspectors appointed for that purpose, an examination and inspection of all cattle, sheep, swine, and goats before they shall be allowed to enter into any slaughtering, packing, meat-canning, rendering, or similar establishment in which they are to be slaughtered and the meat and meat-food products thereof are to be used in interstate or foreign commerce; and all cattle, swine, sheep, and goats found on such inspection to show symptoms of disease shall be set apart and slaughtered separately from all other cattle, sheep, swine, or goats, and when so slaughtered the carcasses of said cattle, sheep, swine, or goats shall be subject to a careful examination and inspection, all as provided by the rules and regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of Agriculture, as herein provided for.

All that I ask is that before meat shall come from any other country into the United States the country from which it is exported shall have established either this system for inspection or some other system equally efficient. If it had been thought that a post-mortem inspection would preserve the country from impure meat, there would have been no provision

in the law for the ante-mortem inspection. This statute was passed a long time ago, and the Department of Agriculture has established in this country a system of inspections before slaughter, and after slaughter another system of inspections. I hope the Senate will not confuse the two things. They are perfectly distinct. The inspections are carried on for the same general purpose, and carried on because one is not adequate without the presence of the other.

In order to show that I want to indicate what the Department of Agriculture has done. I have in my hand a public document of the Sixty-second Congress, third session. It is a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a statement prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture showing the number of persons employed in meat inspection, the amount paid each, and so forth, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1912. It is a very comprehensive document, and indicates better than anything I could say just what the country is doing in order to prevent impure meats from entering interstate commerce.

I wish also to refer to a bulletin issued by the Department of Agriculture, giving instructions that are to govern the branding of carcasses and the primal parts of animals after they are slaughtered.

I read a little of it. It is order 150, regulation 17, section 5:

Beef carcasses.—In each instance the brands shall be affixed so as to mark the following primal parts: Rounds, loins, ribs, chucks, flanks, plates, and briskets; also the kidney fat and cod fat. Other primal parts may be marked if required by local conditions.

Then proceeds the same kind of regulation with regard to calf carcasses, sheep carcasses, shipper pigs, and hog carcasses, canners, and so forth.

I have mentioned these things in order to show that there are two branches of this great preventive system: First, the ante-mortem inspection, and second, the post-mortem inspection; and the committee, unfortunately, has provided for the introduction of foreign meats upon a post-mortem examination only.

I repeat that because I do not believe it is generally understood by my friends on the other side that there is an attempt here to favor the foreign manufacturer of meats as against the home manufacturer of meats.

I, of course, do not expect the activities of the United States to extend to any foreign country, but it is within the power of any foreign country to establish just as efficient a system of inspection as we have, and my amendment is that unless it is so done and unless the President is so advised and unless he issues his proclamation accordingly, no meats can come in from that country, and even after that examination is had and the meats come here, then they ought to pass the same inspection precisely that our meats pass after slaughter and before they are shipped in the way of commerce.

This being accomplished, we have treated the foreign manufacturer exactly as we have treated the home producer of meats; and unless we do exclude meats from countries that have no such system we will have given a premium to the packers of Argentina and the packers of Canada in their effort to supply the people of this country with meat.

While I do not think it is a sound economic proposition, I am conscious of a good deal of sympathy with the desire to supply the people of the country with the necessities of life at the lowest possible cost; but there is no economy in supplying the people with impure meat, and there is no justice in giving a bounty upon the importation of meat. At least treat our own people as though they were entitled to the same consideration that we are endeavoring to extend to the people of other countries.

Mr. PAGE. Before the Senator takes his seat—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to ask him if it is not a fact that after diseased cattle have been slaughtered it is possible to so far remove the indication of disease that the inspector would find it impossible to detect it?

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not intend to enter into the technical part of it, but there are diseases that can be detected by an ante-mortem inspection that can not be detected at all in the meat after slaughter. That is the very purpose of the ante-mortem inspection. I assume that if there were attached here a condition that all meats should be accompanied with the viscera of the animal out of which the meats come there might be an additional protection, but that of course is absurd, and we have the meat here in the carcass, chilled or frozen. The way the meats will come into the United States will be either chilled or frozen, depending upon the distance over which the meats travel, and when they thus reach the United States, although the animals from which they were made may have been so diseased that the meats are utterly unfit for human food, the inspector here will be oftentimes incapable of detecting or exposing that disease.

If the Senate desires to encourage that sort of thing, I shall have to revise my opinion of my very good friends upon the other side. I do not think they want to do anything of the sort.

Mr. LANE. Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. LANE. I wish to confirm the statement of the Senator from Iowa. An examination of fibers and muscles will not show whether the animal has been diseased; but in very few cases will it show the indications of disease. The Senator is right. The presence of the disease can be ascertained by an examination of the animal before it is slaughtered and by an examination of the viscera after it is slaughtered; the more important, I think, is the examination of the viscera. We should require both.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I hope that this will not be looked upon on the other side of the Chamber as a hypercritical suggestion upon my part. This is real. We all know that vast expense has been incurred in the effort to secure pure meat, and if we allow our foreign rival to escape a part of that expense—the expense involved in these investigations—he will bring his meat here under unfair conditions and without regard to the effect upon the public health.

I therefore submit this amendment, reasserting that the chief difference between it and the amendment proposed by the committee is that in mine whatever system is in force in the United States as to ante mortem inspection its equivalent must be found to exist in the country from which the meats come; as to inspection after arrival in America, there is no substantial difference between the committee amendment and my own.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, the fatal errors about the Senator's amendment are, in my opinion, twofold: First, he gives no credence at all to the certificate of any country where a system of inspection is maintained identical with or equal to ours. We have been making the welkin ring with our complaints of foreign governments not accepting our certificates as sufficient evidence of the fact of the proper inspection, ante mortem and post mortem, of our meat.

The next defect in the Senator's amendment is that, no matter whether the foreign country has a system of inspection equal to ours or not, he proposes to subject the meat, after it arrives here, to a reinspection by the officers of this Government, even in the case of countries which have a system of cattle and meat inspection fully equal to our own.

What is the consequence? Some of the meats are brought in cans, some of them are imported in barrels, and they can not be reinspected except by uncanning and unbarreling.

The Senator seems to have misunderstood the committee amendment. He seems to think that the foreign system of inspection, to which the committee refers, is simply post-mortem inspection, whereas the very language of the committee amendment is to the contrary. I read it:

Provided, That meat and meat products brought to the United States shall be subject to the same inspection by the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1906, for domestic cattle and meats—

That refers to the inspection of the meat. Then this follows:

Unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied that the government of the country whence the meat or meat products are exported maintains and enforces a system of inspection—

Inspection of what? Why, both of cattle and meats—equal to our own.

Because up above it says that meat shall be subject to the same inspection as is "provided by the act of June 30, 1906, for domestic cattle and meats."

Now, the language is:

Unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied that the government of the country whence the meat or meat products are exported maintains and enforces a system of inspection—

Not the inspection of meat merely—

equal to our own, or satisfactory to him as being competent to protect the public health.

And so forth.

In which case, under the comity of nations, a system of inspection equal to our own there existing, or a system of inspection satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture as representing our Government, so as to avoid making it maintain a system identical with ours, which they probably would not want to do—they have their own notions and it might go further than ours—then, in that case, under the comity of nations, the certificate of the government of the country whence the meat is imported to this country shall be accepted as sufficient, just as we insist that our certificate of the fact that our meat has been inspected shall be accepted as sufficient.

Another defect about the Senator's amendment is that after the Senator once finds a country which has a system of cattle and meat inspection to suit him, then he lets all meats come in

from that country, whether they have been actually inspected by the Government or not, because he does not require the certificate of that Government to accompany the meats. For example, there is any amount of meat killed in the United States which is never inspected by the Federal Government. Therefore the countries over there demand not only that we shall have a competent system of inspection, but that the certificate of the Government to the fact that the meat has been inspected shall accompany the importations of it into those countries. Under the Senator's amendment, after you had once got yourself satisfied and the President had proclaimed that the system of inspection in the foreign country was sufficient, then the meat could be sent here without a certificate. It might be meat which had not undergone inspection.

Mr. President, if, to "make assurance double sure," the Senator has any doubt about the system of inspection in the foreign country covering cattle as well as meat, if he has any doubt about my conclusions being right, that the inspection refers back to the act of June 30, 1906, and to the language "cattle or meat," that can be cured by putting in the words "of cattle and meat," following the word "inspection," in line 23, so that it would read:

Unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied that the Government of the country whence the meat or meat products are exported maintains and enforces a system of cattle and meat inspection—

Instead of merely a "system of inspection"—

equal to our own, or satisfactory to him as being competent to protect the public health, in which case the certificate of such Government that such inspection has been made shall be sufficient.

If there is any defect in this committee amendment at all, it is that there might be added to it the words "and no meat under any circumstances shall be imported without the certificate of the country whence it was exported."

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I am inclined to think that the criticism of the Senator from Mississippi upon my amendment with regard to the necessity of a certificate accompanying the meat is sound. I think it ought to have that provision in it, and before the amendment is voted upon I will modify it in that way. I had not thought of that particular point.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, Mr. President—

Mr. CUMMINS. If the Senator will wait a moment—

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am willing for this paragraph to be passed over, and the Senator and I can get together, or the Senator and the subcommittee can get together, and we can draw an amendment that will satisfy us both, I suppose.

Mr. CUMMINS. Just a moment before we do pass it over. Let us not obscure the issue. Under the amendment of the committee meats could come here from a country having no system of inspection at all of any kind, and we must accept those meats if they pass the post-mortem inspection provided for in the amendment. That is the thing I desire to avoid. I want those meats to come here, if they come at all, from a country with a system of ante-mortem examination.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Now, let us see if we understand each other. Does the Senator want to fix it so that no meat can be imported from Mexico?

Mr. CUMMINS. Well, I have not particularized as to countries. I know that we do this thing in order to protect our people from our own manufacturers, and I assume that we ought to require the same thing of a foreign manufacturer.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, one other point and I shall cease talking. There seems to be an impression in the minds of some Senators that this amendment here is to provide for the inspection of cattle. That is provided for under the existing law, which applies not only to cattle in interstate commerce but to cattle in foreign commerce as well, and the Department of Agriculture has a very rigid inspection of live cattle brought into the country. That, however, has nothing to do with this amendment, but I found that idea in the minds of some of the Senators and I wanted to dissipate it. That is under a different law. I do not think the Senator's amendment is as good as the committee amendment. It may be that the committee amendment might be strengthened, and I am perfectly willing that it shall go back to the committee for that purpose, and I shall be very much pleased at any time to call the subcommittee together and have the Senator appear, and we will sit as a subcommittee and concoct an amendment that will be satisfactory.

Mr. CUMMINS. I will be glad to attend in answer to any summons of that kind.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, as I will undoubtedly submit an amendment to this particular paragraph, I desire to present it now, so that it may be considered by the committee. I would prefer, if it were possible, that a duty should be levied equal in amount to the duty levied by any other country upon our meats; but I am inclined to think that would be in

conflict with the favored-nation clause of some of our treaties, and hence that we would have to be specific in the general law. I present the amendment with the statement that I will ask for a vote on it during the consideration of the particular paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 142, at the end of line 26, it is proposed to add the following proviso:

Provided further, That any of the foregoing specified articles shall be subject to a duty of 20 per cent ad valorem when imported, directly or indirectly, from any country, dependency, or other subdivision of Government, which imposes such a duty on such articles imported from the United States.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Iowa whether the act of June 30, 1906, referred to provides for ante mortem inspection?

Mr. CUMMINS. It does. The act of June 30, 1906, is the agricultural appropriation bill for that year, and the part of it relating to inspection is practically, if not exactly, reproduced in the appropriation act of March 4, 1907, and is the present law upon the subject. It does provide for ante-mortem inspection.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. In what respect does the act of 1908 differ?

Mr. CUMMINS. There is no difference; the two are substantially identical.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask that the Secretary proceed with the reading of the bill.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President—

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand that action is not desired on the pending paragraph this afternoon.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have asked that that paragraph go over.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understood that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] had asked that it be considered hereafter.

Mr. NORRIS. Before the paragraph goes over, I desire to make an observation. I should like the attention of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS]. In regard to this particular proviso I think the words commencing at the end of line 23, "or satisfactory to him as being competent to protect the public health," ought to be stricken out of the proviso.

It strikes me that, containing these words, the proviso certainly gives to the foreign shipper of meats an advantage over the producer in this country. It is set forth in the beginning of the proviso:

That meat and meat products brought to the United States shall be subject to the same inspection by the Bureau of Animal Industry of the Department of Agriculture as prescribed by the act of June 30, 1906, for domestic cattle and meats, unless—

Here are the two exceptions—I have no fault to find with the first one—

Unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied that the Government of the country whence meat or meat products are exported maintains and enforces a system of inspection equal to our own—

It seems to me that is all right; I do not see how anyone could find fault with that; and, if it ended there, I would have no criticism to make. That is one exception. Here is the other one, and these are the words that I think should be stricken out:

Or satisfactory to him as being competent to protect the public health.

In our law there is no such exception existing.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes; but we make our own law.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The purpose of that was this: We can not enforce identity of legislation—

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And so we are compelled to leave it to somebody to determine when different legislation is competent to accomplish the purpose which we wish, which is to protect the public health, and in that event we thought the Secretary of Agriculture was the proper person to determine it.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator will listen a moment, I think that situation is completely met by the first exception, namely, that the inspection law of the foreign country must be equal to our own. It does not have to be identical, and nobody is contending that it should be. Let us take, for instance, a producer of meats here—

Mr. WILLIAMS. One moment. It says "the same," and then it says "equal to," and then it says "shall be satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture."

Mr. NORRIS. That is what I am going to discuss.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Suppose there was some provision in our law that was not of any very great importance and the foreign

country had the remainder of the law, but did not have that particular provision, it would not be equal to ours, would it?

Mr. NORRIS. If the Secretary of Agriculture found that the foreign law of inspection was equal to ours, even though it had something ours did not have or omitted something that ours did have, he would have the right to admit the meats, even though the language I want stricken out was stricken out. Let us take our own people, and suppose we have a Secretary of Agriculture who has an idea of meat inspection that does not come up to the prescribed rule laid down by the law of Congress—we may have such a Secretary at some time; and I say that without intending to cast any reflection upon any Secretary of Agriculture—there may be a difference between honest men's minds as to what the inspection should be, but in this country we have provided by law what that inspection shall be; and the Secretary of Agriculture will enforce that law, even though he thinks the law is too severe. That applies to everybody in this country who produces meat products and puts them into interstate commerce.

With the foreigner, however, it would be different. The Secretary would then say: "You have not complied with our law over there, but so far as my judgment is concerned your law is good enough, and I will let it go through," and with this amendment he would have a right to do it. In this country they must comply with a law that we have laid down. That would give to the foreigner the right to come in if the Secretary was willing that he should do so, whether he had an inspection law that was equal to our own or not. That is a discrimination that I do not believe the Senator wants to make.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Our intent, at any rate, was that whether their inspection law was equal to ours or not, even if in our opinion it was not so good a system of inspection as ours, still if in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture it was a system competent to protect the public health the meat should be allowed to come in for the use of the American people.

It is not the easiest thing in the world, you know, to do what we are trying to do here. Nations have been quarreling for I do not know how many years about the abstract proposition, which does not disturb anybody's peace or comfort, as to what degree of longitude is to be taken as a beginning in making maps. They have never agreed about it yet. They can not agree about an equal unit of coinage; and they never will make statutes that are equal to one another upon the subject of meat inspection.

One will be superior, in the opinion of a foreign country, and ours will be superior in our opinion. But who is going to judge of the quality? This language was put in here afterwards for the very purpose which seems to strike the Senator as being a discrimination against our own people. It is not, because if Congress changed our present inspection laws it might change them for the worse.

Mr. NORRIS. Why, of course.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The system might not be so good as it is now.

Mr. NORRIS. And it might make them better; but Congress has the right to do that, and the Secretary of Agriculture has not.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But we have conferred upon the Secretary of Agriculture, in all of our domestic quarantine laws and everything else, most exhaustive powers.

Mr. NORRIS. Exactly; but we have not conferred on him in this particular line the right to say whether or not meat produced in this country which applies for admission into interstate commerce shall go into interstate commerce. We have prescribed by law when it shall go in and when it shall stay out.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, we prescribe by law to our own citizens a certain inspection, because we have the sovereign power to do it. We can not prescribe to foreign nations, under any comity of nations that exists anywhere, that they shall adopt certain legislation.

Mr. NORRIS. Nobody contends that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All we have a right to do is to say that for the purpose which we have in view, to wit, the protection of the people of America in their public health against diseased or bad meats or meats which have not been subjected to an inspection sufficient to satisfy us that they are not dangerous, they shall not be included among the meats admitted free under this paragraph.

By the way, we did not draw up this paragraph by ourselves in 10 minutes. We took some little thought about it, and we consulted the Bureau of Animal Industry about it. We have not acted like children at play at all. So when we got through we did not stop where the Senator wants us to stop, because it occurred to us that there still might be nations that had inspection laws which were not so good as ours, in our opinion at

any rate. And yet which, in the opinion of the Secretary of Agriculture—for the right to give the opinion had to be lodged somewhere—were of such a character as to protect the public health of the American people from bad meat.

Mr. NORRIS. Does the Senator mean to say that his committee had the intention of admitting meat from foreign countries where the inspection was not so good as is required of our own people to get their meat into interstate commerce?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Absolutely, provided it was good enough to satisfy the Secretary of Agriculture that the meat coming from there would not injure our people.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, then, the Senator has undertaken to do exactly what he has done.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. He has provided here that meats that come from a foreign country need not bear so critical an inspection as meats that are produced in this country, provided the Secretary of Agriculture is of the opinion that it would not hurt anybody to eat them.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Or provided the Secretary of Agriculture is of the opinion that the system of inspection they have is good enough to protect the public health.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; that it is good enough to protect the public health. Let me call the Senator's attention to this condition: Suppose a bill were brought in here, and were up for consideration to-day, that would change all the law we have on the subject by simply substituting for it these words:

That no meat produced in the United States shall be permitted to enter into interstate commerce unless it has been inspected in such a way that it is satisfactory to the Secretary of Agriculture as being competent to protect the public health.

Does the Senator suppose we would pass a law of that kind? Yet that is the kind of law we are going to pass, if we pass this bill, with regard to meat coming from a foreign country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. We would not pass such a law, for the very simple reason that must be plain and palpable and obvious to anybody—that we, as a Congress, have the power to prescribe the exact regulations which we desire; and therefore it would be stupid, or it would be cowardly, one or the other, to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to act as the legislature in our stead. But we have no legislative power abroad.

Mr. NORRIS. Why, of course not; but you are going to let the Secretary of Agriculture be the legislature as far as imported meats are concerned. It is true that we can not legislate for foreign countries. We can legislate for our own, however; and we can provide by law rules and regulations that must be complied with by the foreigner before he is permitted to bring his products into this country. That is what we ought to do.

Mr. WILLIAMS. There is no doubt about that; and we could provide in this very act, if we chose, that no meat should be admitted into America at all unless the country whence it was imported had adopted in its exact language the law of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But that was not the intention of the committee, and that is why the committee did not do it.

Mr. NORRIS. And that is not my intention. I would not want to have the committee do that. I think you have gone as far as you ought to go when you make the first exception, and say that unless the Secretary of Agriculture shall be satisfied that the government of the country whence the meat or meat products are exported makes and enforces a system of inspection equal to our own we will not regard it as sufficient.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. NORRIS. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. I simply wanted to suggest to the Senator that other countries have compelled us in the past to make regulations satisfactory to them by excluding our meats at times, as we all know. We have had great controversies with Germany, and also at one time with England, as to the regulations governing the inspection of our meats.

This amendment, if the Senator will pardon me a moment, contains two antagonistic propositions. One is that the foreign system shall be, in the judgment of the Secretary, which we must invoke, equal in efficiency to our own. The other practically wipes out that provision, and says that any system which the Secretary thinks is competent to maintain the public health shall be accepted.

Mr. WARREN. May I ask the Senator from Massachusetts a question? I will not ask him what the regulation is now, but has not England demanded of us a great deal of the time that our hogs, sheep, and cattle shall go there alive and be slaughtered in England rather than taken in there as meat?

Mr. LODGE. Certainly. We have had many controversies about it; we have had to satisfy them as to the character of our inspection and regulation, and there is no reason why they should not satisfy us.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, they do.

Mr. LODGE. I say satisfy us—satisfy the law that Congress passes, not the Secretary.

Mr. WILLIAMS. In reference to what the Senator from Wyoming has just said, of course some of these nations, desirous of prohibiting the entry of American meat, and not desirous of saying so in so many words, went to very great extremes. Germany demanded an inspection of the viscera, because she knew it was practically an impossibility, and therefore prohibited our meats. She had a right to do that. We would have a right to say here, if we wanted to, that that should be done, of course; but we do not want to. We are not trying to make this provision impracticable of administration. We are trying to get meat for the American people from abroad free of duty, but at the same time we are trying to take every proper measure to see that it is healthful.

Mr. LODGE. Germany was obliged to abandon those extreme positions.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand; I was simply illustrating how that would be.

Mr. WARREN. Not only have we done that, but we have by legislation provided for our own people a very exacting law and regulation. I assume the Senator from Mississippi and his party expect that we shall be as particular as to the meat from other countries as we are with the packers in our own country who are delivering food to us across State lines.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no fear that the Secretary of Agriculture will ever admit meat from a country that does not establish a system that protects the public health.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. CUMMINS. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will not lose sight of the fact that the part of the committee amendment to which he has referred relates only to the admission of meats upon a certificate, and without any examination on the part of this country. I have not objected to that part of the amendment so much as I have to the other, which admits meats into this country without any ante-mortem inspection.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course I was not discussing the Senator's amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. I did not know whether it had caught the eye of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I understood, of course, the Senator's argument; but this particular amendment applies to an entirely different point.

Mr. CUMMINS. The proviso there, or the subsequent part of the amendment, simply allows meats to come in without any home examination provided the Secretary of Agriculture finds there is a foreign system of inspection something like our own.

Mr. NORRIS. He does not even need to find that it is something like our own if it satisfies him.

Mr. CUMMINS. No; something like our own, or what he thinks to be sufficient to protect our people.

Mr. NORRIS. He may, as a matter of fact, know, and it may be public knowledge, that it has not any resemblance to our system of inspection. It may be nowhere near so good. If the man who happens to be Secretary of Agriculture thinks it is good enough, he can issue an order that will permit meat from that country to come in on the certificate of the Government of the country that it has made the inspection which he has said, in his judgment, is good enough.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, may I make an inquiry?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SHERMAN. I wish to clear up my mind on one point as to this amendment, or either amendment. Will meats bearing a foreign certificate thereby become incapable of being excluded from the port of entry if they have spoiled in transit?

I have known of a good many cases where meat at the initial point of shipment was all right, but at destination it was not. If it comes to our port with a foreign certificate, under this paragraph, as written, will it or not be admitted? If it comes from a government whose system of inspection has been approved by the Secretary of Agriculture—and on that I am making no question—it comes bearing a foreign certificate, but when it reaches the port of entry here it may have been spoiled in transit, from various causes, such as defective re-

frigeration, climatic causes, defects in the construction of the vessel, storms, and the like. That frequently happens in transit.

After the meat has received its certificate from a foreign government, is it not, under that certificate, proper to admit it, and would it not be admitted?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, while the Senator's question has no bearing on the point that I was making in regard to this particular amendment, it seems to me clear, since he has propounded the query to me, that the certificate of the foreign Government would go only to show, and would be evidence only to show, that the inspection provided for by the foreign country had been made in regard to the particular meat in question. It might be excluded for other reasons, of course. The point I make on this amendment is that if we pass this proviso without any change we provide one rule and one law for American meat in interstate commerce and an entirely different one that may be less exacting when the meat comes from a foreign country.

I desire to offer and have pending for the consideration of the committee or the Senate when this paragraph is taken up, as I understand it is going over, an amendment to strike out the words commencing with the word "or," in line 23, and ending with the word "health," in line 25.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to strike out of the committee amendment, commencing on line 23, page 142, the following words:

Or satisfactory to him as being competent to protect the public health.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to be pending when this paragraph comes back. I want to give notice of it now, so as to have no doubt about the point I make. After the word "inspection" I move to insert the words "of cattle and meat."

I do that so that there will be no doubt of the character of the inspection.

Mr. CUMMINS. May I ask the Senator from Mississippi just where that will come in?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Right after the word "inspection."

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I am sure that our friends on the other side feel that we have made good progress to-day in the consideration of the bill.

Mr. KERN. Will the Senator yield to me for a certain motion?

Mr. GALLINGER. It is 6 o'clock, and I would be glad to yield.

Mr. KERN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to, and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, August 25, 1913, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

Monday, August 25, 1913.

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last was read and approved.

CALLING OF THE ROLL.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Gallinger	Martine, N. J.	Smith, Ariz.
Bacon	Hughes	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	James	Norris	Smith, S. C.
Borah	Johnson	O'Gorman	Smoot
Brady	Jones	Oliver	Sterling
Brandegee	Kenyon	Overman	Stone
Bristow	Kern	Page	Sutherland
Bryan	La Follette	Perkins	Swanson
Chamberlain	Lane	Pittman	Thomas
Chilton	Lea	Pomeroy	Thompson
Clapp	Lewis	Ransdell	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Lippitt	Robinson	Townsend
Clarke, Ark.	Lodge	Sheppard	Vardaman
Cummins	McCumber	Sherman	Walsh
Fall	McLean	Shively	Weeks
Fletcher	Martin, Va.	Simmons	Williams

Mr. SHEPPARD. My colleague [Mr. CULBERSON] is unavoidably absent. He is paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. DU PONT]. This announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. JAMES. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. BRADLEY] is detained from presence here by reason of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Indiana [Mr.